The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXXXV NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 22, 1936 NUMBER 1103

Contents

The Week 293

Editorials

Alternatives to the A. A. A. 296
Dynamite in Mongolia 297
Blueprints for a Planned Economy 298
Publicity for Incomes 299

General Articles

What Sanctions Have Meant to Italy ..... Sylvia Saunders 300
Justice Roberts and Justice Stone ..... John T. Flynn 303
"Without Work Experience" ..... Jonathan Mitchell 306
Canadian Report ..... T. R. Carskadon 309
Forming a People's Front ..... William P. Mangold 310
Bird-Witted (verse) ..... Marianne Moore 311
Washington Notes ..... T. R. B. 312
Best Neglected Film ..... Otis Ferguson 313

Correspondence 314

Books in Review

Monsieur de Montherlant ..... Malcolm Cowley 315
The Road to Revision ..... C. Hartley Grattan 316
Behind the Trademark ..... Will Maslow 316
Dead End ..... Eleanor Clark 317
"Go Farther Than I Went!" ..... Norbert Guterman 317
The Journalist as Historian ..... Robert Morss Lovett 318
Return from Venusberg ..... Louis Kronenberger 318
Books in Brief 319

The Week

A NEW peace plan to end the Italo-Ethiopian war is in the making. Persistent reports come from several European capitals that diplomats are working behind the scenes to this end. While it is too early to discuss its detailed terms, a basis for them may be found in the plan of the Committee of Five and in Emperor Haile Selassie's offer to Italy, both of which were brought forward a few days before the fighting began. To preserve the prestige of the League of Nations, a first step probably will be a suggestion for a League committee of inquiry to look into allegations of "uncivilized practices" in Ethiopia. This would be accompanied by Ethiopia's giving to Italy large concessions of territory and trade privileges, and it is hinted that Italy might also get some other colonies to be taken, if it can be managed, from Portugal. Similar concessions may be given to Germany in order to soothe Hitler's guilty conscience. As the hour for Bruno Hauptmann's execution drew near, his attorneys ap-

What wrecked the Hoare-Laval plan was not, primarily, its iniquity but the fact that French officials let it leak out before Haile Selassie had accepted its provisions. That mistake will not be made again. The new terms will certainly be outrageous, they will be a bitter blow at the League's system for collective security, but responsible British and French officials evidently believe that such a solution is better than the only alternative which, they are now convinced, is a war with Italy that might easily turn into a general conflict.

AFTER days of anxious consultation, President Roosevelt and Secretary Wallace have announced the outlines of their new agricultural policy to take the place of the A.A.A. The administration sets its face against any scheme to subsidize dumping of surplus crops abroad, on the ground that such plans would mean exhausting the fertility of American soil for no purpose except to enrich a limited number of traders. The new plan is based, instead, on the conservation of our agricultural resources. Farmers would be paid bounties for preventing erosion, for rotating their crops, for planting grasses which bind and enrich the soil instead of more profitable cash crops which destroy fertility. These payments would aggregate about $500,000,000 annually, roughly the amount paid under the A.A.A.; the money would come from the Treasury and be raised by new, and as yet unspecified, taxes. Local committees all over the country would decide what farmers deserved these bounties; there would be no contracts, and the payments would be made after fulfilment of the government's standards, and not before. While the administration was working out these plans, Congress moved steadily forward toward immediate cash payment of the soldiers' bonus, at a present cost estimated at one and a quarter billion dollars, payment perhaps to be made with "baby bonds" which the veteran could cash at the nearest post office if he chose. The Scottsboro defendants received a setback when the appeal for trial in the federal court was denied; observers on the spot believe that another verdict of guilty is in the making.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HEARINGS in the House and Senate Foreign Relations Committees were held last week as Congress prepared to hammer out a permanent neutrality policy. The unexpected surrender by Mr. Roosevelt and the Department of State on the question of discretionary powers for the President has eliminated the hard struggle that was expected between the administration and the isolationists. One more step in the same direction was taken when the President's authority to suspend all exports to belligerents in order to "prevent the prolongation or expansion of war" was dropped by the Senate committee with Secretary Hull's approval. Opposition to a complete embargo had been almost universal, and it was feared, and properly, that this proposal would be interpreted as a promise to participate in League sanctions. The authority to hold all exports down to the pre-war normal and to require even these to be shipped at the exporter's risk, still remains in the bill. The Nye-Clark group is seeking in general to have all these actions removed from the President's discretion and made mandatory, or referred back to Congress for immediate action. In this we believe these Senators are wholly right and the President and Mr. Hull are wholly wrong. The responsibility for making decisions that may mean peace or war is too big for any one man.

IT IS no secret that the war in Africa is going badly from Italy's point of view. The rainy season is not far off, and already storms in certain areas have hampered military operations and washed out some of the new roads the Italians have so painfully constructed. Through the censorship there filter stories of unrest at home as even the partial and limited sanctions applied by the League of Nations begin to have some effect; the conditions there are reported by Miss Sylvia Saunders in this week's issue of The New Republic. Particularly serious are reports of mutinies among troops from the Italian Tyrol (Austrian territory before 1919) and of thousands of men who are fleeing from the country to evade military service. Fresh evidence of the new Franco-British understanding comes with the news that the fleets of these two powers will engage in joint "spring maneuvers" in or near the Mediterranean about the time the League resumes discussion of an embargo on oil—though Geneva announces with all but visible relief that the new American policy of permitting normal trade to continue probably makes such an embargo impossible. In London the naval conference drags along in such a pessimistic atmosphere that the news Japan would remain a little longer is hailed as an important victory. While Spain appears to be on the brink of a new coup d'etat, a Cuban election has put into office Dr. Miguel Gomez, the coalition candidate of the Republicans, Nationalists and Liberals; Cuban radicals charge that he is the hand-picked candidate of the United States which

THE cause of those seeking to make neutrality mandatory has been greatly aided by the first week's disclosures in the long awaited investigation, by the Senate Munitions Committee, of the part J. P. Morgan and Company played in bringing the United States into the Great War. Only the most simple-minded have ever supposed it could be shown that "the international bankers" as a group made enormous loans to the Allies and then ordered the United States to go to war in order to protect them. What did happen, and the Senate Committee has already gone a long way toward proving it, is that the bankers persuaded the government to permit the creation of a huge vested interest here which would have been ruined if the Allies had failed to win the War. Consciously or unconsciously, directly or indirectly, that fact had an enormous influence on the development of pro-Ally spirit and was a contributing factor of great importance in finally bringing us into the War. The Senate Committee has revealed a group of deeply significant facts: that Robert Lansing was strongly pro-Ally from the very beginning, long before he became Secretary of State; that William Jennings Bryan was years ahead of any other high official in realizing the consequence of loans to the Allies and in the policy he sought to pursue; that President Wilson consented to enormous loans to Great Britain and France and had in truth abandoned the policy of neutrality more than a year before he was reëlected on the slogan, "He kept us out of war." The first week of the renewed hearings strongly underlines the wisdom of a neutrality policy that leaves a minimum of discretion to the executive branch, a neutrality policy based on the assumption that peace is terribly expensive, and is worth it.

BOTH the shipping interests and the officials of the International Seamen's Union are getting increasingly worried. In Washington, D. C., where the sailors' union is holding its first convention in five years, it is announced that the meetings will be secret, though usually such gatherings are open to the press. At the same time spokesmen for the shipowners are threatening to break off all relations with the union, which would mean refusal to sign a new contract to replace the one that expired on December 31. The reason given for these maneuvers happens to be the same in both instances: that the seamen, especially on the Pacific Coast, are getting out of hand, are calling strikes in violation of their agreements and are misleading the seamen in the Eastern and Gulf Port districts. In somewhat different language, the situation may be explained as follows: Seamen on the West Coast receive $62.50 —$5 a month more than seamen sailing from other ports; in addition, they are paid for overtime. Naturally, seamen in the Eastern and Gulf ports are wondering why they should not enjoy working conditions on a par with their brothers on the Pacific

LICENSED TO HHZ.ORG ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ern pay when they reached San Francisco. The crews of several other ships have threatened to do likewise. Meanwhile, the maritime unions in the Gulf district, dissatisfied with the feeble efforts of their international officers to obtain better working conditions, have banded together in a Maritime Federation, comparable to the Maritime Federation of the Pacific. Thus, both the shipowners and the union officials, who like to settle things "around a table," are fearful that they may have their hands forced to an unaccustomed degree.

WHAT might have been another Mooney-Billings case was averted recently in San Francisco when four members of the Ship Scalers' Union were found not guilty of murder by a jury. The case arose from an incident that took place in the union headquarters during a meeting. Four men who, the union says, had been sent to the hall—by parties unknown—to make trouble, started a riot. During this a man named Vincent Torres fell from a window while attempting escape, and was killed. The police, with typical logic, arrested four members of the union and charged them with having murdered Torres, although there was no evidence to support this accusation. The jury did not accept the police interpretation of what happened and the four defendants were set free. Three days before the case ended, about 10,000 maritime workers in San Francisco and several other Coast cities engaged in a demonstration strike of one-half hour in protest against what they termed a frame-up. The Waterfront Employers' Association, according to a report in The Pacific Weekly, promptly ran true to form by saying this strike was the work of Moscow.

IT IS grand news, in our opinion, that Herman Shumlin, producer of "The Children's Hour," has brought suit to prevent the Boston censors from prohibiting performances of that play. The suit will be brought in federal court, and this means that there is at least a good chance of getting around the ignorance and prejudice of the Boston municipal government, which have long caused the name of that city to occasion laughter and tears among civilized people the world over. It is also interesting to note that suits for $300,000 for libel and slander have been filed against the Mayor and the City Censor of Boston on behalf of the play, the leading lady and the producer. Mayor F. W. Mansfield has stated that the drama has "a revolting theme and tends to pander to the abnormal appetites of those who are attracted by such stuff." Speaking out of familiarity with the play and its effect upon audiences, we can assure Mayor Mansfield that his statements are false. For many years the censorship in Boston was in the hands of men who were not competent to judge literary merit, whose own taste ran to cheap popular novels and burlesque shows, men who rarely interfered with vulgarity so Nellie could characterize as "not proper." We should welcome evidence that those times have changed.

NEW YORK, to be sure, is not in any position to cast stones at Boston just now. Boston has its Board of Censorship, but New York has its John S. Sumner of the Society for the Suppression of Vice. Mr. Sumner has recently been active against a book reviewed in this issue of The New Republic, André Gide's "If It Die." Mr. Guterman in his review shows that this is a serious and honest work describing the plight of an individual whose abnormality can well be explained in terms of his history. The reviewer observes: "Amateurs of the scabrous will be disappointed, for Gide is never purer than in impurity." The theory that such a work could ever be confused with ordinary filth for filth's sake seems too fantastic to be considered seriously; yet Mr. Sumner has so considered it and has haled into court a reputable salesman of a reputable bookstore, after having induced the crime, if there be one, by sending a plainclothesman to buy a copy of the work in question. Having known Mr. Sumner and his work for many years, we are convinced that he is incapable of discriminating between a serious work of art and a piece of commercial lubricity.

GREAT pressure is being put on President Roosevelt to pay the bonus with the large unexpended balances of the $4,000,000,000 work-relief fund. This has long been urged as a solution of the bonus problem by the Republican minority in Congress, and lately has been adopted by reactionary Democrats. The objective of the Republicans—frankly avowed by Colonel Frank Knox and other party spokesmen—is to exhaust the relief fund, and thus prevent Mr. Roosevelt from receiving the political benefit next fall of continuing expenditures for the W. P. A. and public-works programs. It would, of course, be a shameless betrayal of the unemployed in favor of veterans who may or may not be in need of government assistance, and, especially since the proposal would work to his political disadvantage, Mr. Roosevelt can probably be counted on to oppose it.

HARMFUL as it is for a political party to take money from big business, it is just as inexcusable for it to hijack funds from federal employees. At the Jackson Day dinner in Washington, which Mr. Roosevelt addressed last week, tickets were $50 a plate, and—according to published newspaper reports—all federal office-holders receiving $5,000 a year or more were politely asked to make reservations. A newspaper dispatch from Rockford, Illinois, gives an idea of what happened throughout the country. In Rockford, where the charge was $3 a plate, of which $2 went into the party treasury, agents were appointed for each division of the local

LICENSED TO MZ BBS
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Alternatives to the A.A.A.

AN OUTBURST of plans to do something about the farmers has naturally followed the decision of the Supreme Court invalidating the A.A.A. Some of these are old ideas, resuscitated before the decision by people who did not like the A.A.A. for one reason or another, or by politicians who wanted to oppose it for partisan reasons, but did not dare to do so without offering a substitute. The chances are that most of these schemes would be declared unconstitutional by a Supreme Court majority that is bent upon preventing federal control of agriculture. Since we have first to decide, however, what plans are desirable in themselves before dealing with the socially irrelevant question of whether the Court-interpreted Constitution would permit them, let us review the leading proposals.

First in point of age and popular support is the good old McNary-Haugen scheme, vetoed by both Coolidge and Hoover. It is an ingenious device to make the protective tariff effective on crops like wheat and cotton, of which this country produces an exportable surplus. Naturally, a simple tariff laid on imports does not keep up the price of the domestic article, when more is produced here than can be sold in this country anyway. In this case the domestic price will fall to the price on the world market, tariff or no tariff. The plan therefore proposes that a government agency shall buy the entire exportable surplus of these crops, paying for it at the world price, plus the tariff. This will keep domestic prices above the world level by the amount of the protection. The buying agency is to sell the surplus for export, at whatever it will bring. This operation naturally will cause a loss to the government agency. How is the loss to be paid? Here comes the sleight-of-hand. Watch closely. It is to be collected from the growers themselves, in proportion to the amount they raise. This "equalization fee," deducted from farmers' earnings, has the same effect as if they had sold the exported part of the crop directly at world prices, while receiving the higher domestic price for the rest. It is a counterpart of the dumping technique, employed by industries that can control prices. In this case the government is called in to do the dumping.

The chief economic objection, aside from the difficulty of administering the equalization fee, its probable unpopularity among growers who did not understand it, and the likelihood that it would be found unconstitutional, is that there is no control of production involved. The higher prices would probably stimulate greater output. This would mean more and more to be exported. Either the volume of exports would grow so large in relation to domestic sales, or the world price would fall so low, that the farmers would eventually be deprived of all benefit. This would be particularly the case

Next in line is the export debenture, invented to get round the difficulties of the equalization fee. This is sleight-of-hand from the very beginning. Exporters of crops would receive, in addition to the proceeds of their sales, debentures from the government, equivalent to the American tariff. If there were a duty of 40 cents a bushel on wheat, an exporter of 100 bushels would receive debentures with a face value of $40, in addition to the proceeds of his sale. These debentures would be receivable by the government in payment of import duties. They would thus be bought, at a slight discount, by importers who had to pay duties. The exporters would in consequence receive the world price for wheat plus a little less than the tariff, and the internal price of wheat would not be driven down to the world price. The government would pay the subsidy, in the form of a reduction of tariff receipts. It is argued that this subsidy is justifiable, because the protective tariff itself is an instrument, not for raising revenues, but for subsidizing the producers of protected articles. As in the McNary-Haugen plan, the objection to the debenture plan is that there is no way of preventing the output from growing, stimulated by the higher prices, until the subsidy became an intolerable burden and the farmers themselves lost all benefit, through the depressing effect upon world prices of the dumping process.

Other plans are variants of the Farm Board scheme that actually was in effect under Hoover. This involved a government agency to buy part of the surplus in order to keep prices up. It was a silly scheme, because no method was provided to dispose of the surplus without selling it again in such a way as to depress prices. If the government did not sell, it held the bag; if it planned to sell, prices were continually suffering anyway because of fears that it might. From the beginning, the plan was a fraud that did more harm than good—a typical piece of Hooverian economics. It was adapted only to a situation in which variations in yield from one growing season to another might cause difficulty, but that was not the situation of which the farmers complained. They produced every year more than could be sold at home; consequently they had to sell in a non-protected market while they bought in a protected one. What they complained of was the disparity between agricultural and industrial prices.

The administration has correctly, it appears to us, rejected all plans that look toward a subsidy on exports. It also sees correctly that if high prices are to be maintained for crops, the only way to do it is to hold production down. Of course, the farmers like all other sellers would like high prices and unrestricted production at the same time, but we have yet to find anybody who will explain how that can be worked, especially in the capitalist system. Since direct restriction of output under the A.A.A. is no longer permissible, the administration seems

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ginal land out of crop production. This may be done by purchase or rental of land, or it may be done by paying individual farmers to do exactly what they did under the A.A.A., but without making a contract in advance that gives the government regulatory powers. And this subterfuge, if adopted, may still not satisfy Mr. Justice Roberts.

It is a good thing that land should not be put to uses for which it is not well adapted. It is a good thing to divert land from the production of surpluses to the production of other foods, like milk and fresh vegetables and meats, of which we do not eat enough. But as a permanent policy, output restriction for its own sake aims in exactly the wrong social direction—except in those cases where there is no real need for so much of the product, at any price. In the case of wheat and cotton, of which we probably are capable of producing more than this country would use if all wants were satisfied, the ideal solution would be to enlarge foreign markets and sales. But practically that is a tough job, because of foreign tariff and trade restrictions, and reduced foreign purchasing power.

There remains the possibility of increasing the farmers' real incomes, and everyone else's as well, by reducing the prices and increasing the output of industrial products. This would cut the farmers' costs and make their earnings go further. It would cut the city population's cost of living and would enable them to buy more farm products. Reduction or elimination of protective tariffs would help in that endeavor. The farmers would be amply justified in demanding this, now that there seems to be no way of their enjoying the same protection as industry. High prices and output controls in industry, however, do not depend solely on tariffs. A complete change in our economic system, which would make possible planning for plenty, is the only real solution of the farm problem. That is something that the present administration has not tackled, and will not. We hope that before long the farmers will stop fooling around with economic patent medicines and old-party politicians, and will join city labor and do the job from the subsoil up.

Dynamite in Mongolia

WILL Japan's aggression in Outer Mongolia furnish the spark to set the Pacific basin ablaze with war? The question becomes pertinent in view of the recent and continuing incidents in that region. The incidents are by no means accidental. They are part of a definite plan of action now being carried out by Japan, which has the Soviet Union at a diplomatic disadvantage, and knows it.

The disadvantage arises from the peculiar status of the Outer Mongolian People's Republic. This remote country whose ancient capital, Kalgan, is at once the chief railhead for northwestern China and the starting point for car-

territory. It first declared for autonomy in 1911, when the Manchu dynasty was overthrown. And in 1915 pressure from Tsarist Russia forced the Chinese Republic to recognize its independence. During the confused years that followed the World War, China managed to reassert some shadow of authority over the region and the Soviet Union formally acknowledged Chinese sovereignty in a treaty signed in 1924.

Meanwhile there grew up in Outer Mongolia a workers' republic that borrowed much of its ideology from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and became allied with the Union by the closest bonds of economic and political interest. Kalgan, which lies just inside the Great Wall, was detached along with the rest of Inner Mongolia and definitely passed into Chinese control. The present capital of Outer Mongolia was established far to the north at Ulan Bator (Urga), which has highway and airline connection with Siberia—with a railway now building—but only overland caravan connection with China proper. Moscow maintained the most cordial relations with Outer Mongolia and established what amounted to a de-facto protectorate over the isolated republic.

There is no legal basis for this arrangement, however. That is the legalistic trump card that Japan holds, and if the Soviet Union should bestir itself to protect the territorial integrity of Outer Mongolia, Japan would call upon the world to witness the 1924 treaty acknowledging Chinese sovereignty and demand to know what the Soviet Union, an aggressor, meant by interfering in affairs beyond its own borders. Thus the Soviet Union, with the most powerful motives for wanting to protect an ally and a vital buffer state, has shown extraordinary patience in the face of a long series of Japanese provocations extending over a number of years.

The Japanese strategy is obvious. The shortest route from Manchukuo to the rich Lake Baikal region in Central Siberia lies through Outer Mongolia. During the period of foreign intervention that followed the Bolshevik revolution, Japan moved troops into Siberia along this route, and later withdrew them the same way. That route is now closed by an independent Outer Mongolian Republic, strongly sympathetic with the Soviet Union. If Japan could gain control of this territory, not only would she reopen the route, but—and this is the crucial point—she would place herself within striking distance of the Trans-Siberian Railway. That railway, of course, is a very literal life-line for the Soviet Union in the war that Japanese militarists proclaim inevitable.

In one sense, then, the whole of the present Japanese-backed autonomy move in North China is an approach to Outer Mongolia. All of the territory is nominally Chinese, and a pretext must be found for Japanese intervention. The pretext is the "Communistic menace." China is unable to cope

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED.

China proper, such requests are easily arranged. The situation in the strong, well organized Outer Mongolian People's Republic is wholly different. Japan wants, above all, a pretext for occupying this country. Hence the border raids by Japanese, Manchukuoan and White Mongolian soldiers to punish Red plotters, the deliberately fomented disputes as to the location of the border, the demands for diplomatic recognition by Manchukuo, the endless "incidents," great and small, to provoke a show of resistance from the Soviet Union and thus demonstrate the reality of the "Bolshevik menace" and the necessity for intervention.

The Soviet Union has shown tremendous patience, adhering always to the strict letter of international usage. Meanwhile the double-tracking of the Trans-Siberian Railway is practically finished, and there is every indication that the Second Five Year Plan, with 1937 set as its goal, will be completed in 1936. There may come a time when Japan will provide just one incident too many, and a major war will sweep the Pacific.

Blueprints for a Planned Economy

DAY BY day evidence accumulates as to the widening recognition of the need and the possibility of social planning. Detailed schemes for social reorganization, which a couple of decades ago would have been superciliously dismissed as the sort of thing "somebody thinks out in bed," are now given respectful consideration and a degree of recognition proportional to the authority and standing of those who propound them.

Two recent books, one published in England and the other in Canada, offer cases in point.[1] Both are carefully worked-out programs for the recasting of the social, economic and political systems of important sections of the earth's population. Both are the product of joint authorship, involving busy persons of such eminence and responsibility that one can hardly conceive of their devoting time and energy to such projects if there were not a reasonable chance that they would have an appreciable effect on the tempo and direction of social change. From the point of view of authorship, the English book is particularly noteworthy. It is signed by 152 persons, who have accepted responsibility for its contents to such an extent that the pronoun "we" is used throughout the book, though a half-dozen have specifically limited their sponsorship to certain sections. This list includes an impressive array of English men and women prominent in many widely diversified fields.

Specially marked as members of the drafting committee are Lord Allen of Hurtwood, W. Arnold Forster, A. Barratt Brown, Geoffrey Crowther, Harold Macmillan and Sir Arthur Salter. The reader is led to surmise that the last-named contributor probably played an important and influential part in the work of the committee. The total list also includes such names as Norman Angell, Cyril Asquith, H. A. L. Fisher, A. L. Hobhouse, J. A. Hobson, A. A. Milne, J. H. Muirhead, Gilbert Murray, Henry W. Nevinson, T. J. O'Connor, B. Seebohm Rowntree, Wickham Steed, Sybil Thorndike, R. C. Trevelyan, H. G. Wells and the Archbishop of York.

The Canadian book is signed by only seven names, though its authorship is credited to the Research Committee of the League for Social Reconstruction.

Both these books are predicated on a frank admission of the chaotic state of the economic life of the respective countries, and the hopelessness of relief or escape under the laissez-faire administration. They recognize the intolerable absurdity of widespread poverty and low levels of living in the face of modern technological and mechanical competence, and the imminent menace to international peace that is latent in the existing situation. They find the only solution in the adoption of an orderly, coherent plan for the rational integration of the political and economic interests of modern society, administerd by highly concentrated authorities, responsible and sensitive to the popular will, democratically expressed. Both books deal largely with the same themes. The great difference between them is in the degree of radicalness manifested, that is, the extent to which they would substitute new forms for the established and traditional features of the system called capitalistic. The English book is so restrained in this respect that it may fairly be considered as aiming at a reformed and controlled capitalism; the Canadian book is avowedly socialistic.

In "The Next Five Years" the proposal commences with the setting up of a planning organization, consisting primarily of a Government Planning Committee and an Economic General Staff. It contemplates a twofold policy: first a long-range program for continuous development, and second a short-range program for times of depression. On this basis it proceeds to discuss in detail such specific aspects of economic life as the organization of industry, banking and finance, foreign trade, agriculture and social justice, and then turns to a second main division devoted to problems of international relations, including the possibility of maintaining and improving a collective peace system and making it work, with special reference to coöperation with America. Space limitations do not permit a detailed summary of all the suggestions made in these two fields. The fact that the general approach

[1] The Next Five Years: An Essay in Political Agreement. London: Macmillan and Company: 336 pages. 5/. Social Planning for Canada, by the Research Committe of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

definitely singled out as appropriate for complete socialization are transport, electricity, insurance, the distributive system in certain of its branches, mining royalties and the manufacture of armaments. But a humanitarian outlook is manifested throughout.

The Canadian book is much more explicit in its analysis of the abuses, inequities, cruelties and inefficiencies of the existing system. It does not hesitate to tell names, dates and figures. While its interest avowedly centers in the Canadian situation and Canadian problems, much of its discussion has a general application to the question of socialization. Its criticism of Social Credit is trenchant and timely, its discussion of the rational method of socialistic appropriation is clear and moderate, and it demonstrates convincingly that much of the extension of public ownership that has been witnessed under the sway of capitalism represents an unloading on the public of enterprises and services that private business has found burdensome and unprofitable. As indicated, its conclusions are far more drastic than those recommended for England.

But the most important thing about both these books is not their content, but their nature and the fact that they have been written at all. They are both "essays"—trials, ventures—in political agreement. Representing, as they do, a determined and deliberate effort to bring together into agreement a large number of influential persons for the purpose of directing social change, they constitute phenomena of the same order, though of course not of the same magnitude, as the League of Nations, The World Court and the Kellogg-Briand Pact. They register a conviction that mankind is not condemned to resign its destiny to the play of blind, impersonal "natural forces," but that we can, if we will, take command of the course of our own affairs, and bend them to a pattern of intelligent collective well-being.

Publicity for Incomes

ONCE AGAIN, the government has made public a number of large incomes received by individuals in the United States; the current list includes names of all officers of corporations receiving salaries of $15,000 or more annually. Thus the country has been permitted to learn that William Randolph Hearst gets $500,000 a year as a salary from Hearst Consolidated Publications. Mae West, the movie star, received in one year $329,000. Arthur Brisbane gets $265,000 and W. S. Gifford, president of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, $210,000. W. S. Paley, of the Columbia Broadcasting System, is down for $147,000, while M. H. Aylesworth, when he filled a comparable post with the National Broadcasting Company, received only a modest $45,000. Frank Knox, publisher of The Chicago Daily News, and a possible Republican presidential nominee, had a destinies of The Saturday Evening Post. George W. Hill of the American Tobacco Company got $150,000 while Stanley Resor, president of the advertising agency, the J. Walter Thompson Company, got $90,000. The New York Daily News, a popular morning tabloid, pays five salaries each of which is in excess of $100,000. In many of these cases, of course, the individual had additional sources of income, some of which were probably far larger than the items listed. In other instances, it is fair to assume that excessive salaries were paid in an endeavor to reduce the corporation's own profits, for tax purposes.

On every occasion when the government makes public the incomes of wealthy persons, loud complaints are heard that this constitutes an invasion of privacy. We are told that because of this publicity these individuals will become the prey of racketeers, kidnapers and cranks. In considering the merits of such criticism it is well to bear in mind that in the past, the wealthy have been, broadly speaking, the only element in the community exempt from such information. The wages paid to workers in industry are nearly always a matter of public record. College professors' salaries are known, and are frequently printed in the catalogues. Employees of the federal government and of most of the states and cities receive stipends that are officially recorded. The American temperament being what it is, the income of almost anyone can be estimated, within broad limits, from the scale on which he lives.

Making public the salaries paid by corporations performs a distinct public service; for example, the facts can be checked against the wages paid by the same corporation and against the customary plea of poverty when the workers ask an increase in those wages. As for the danger from racketeers and kidnapers, the first point to make is that these gentry do not need to wait for a government publication to help them select their potential victims; and in the second place, the answer in the long run is for the government to fight the underworld directly, and not by withholding possibly useful data.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1936, IN THE U. S., BY THE NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 40 EAST 49TH STREET, NEW YORK CITY. BRUCE BLIVEN, PRESIDENT, DANIEL MEBANE, TREASURER.

EDITORS

BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

HAMILTON BASSO H. N. BRAILSFORD JOHN DEWEY
JOHN T. FLYNN WALDO FRANK E. C. LINDEMAN
W. P. MANGOLD R. G. TUGWELL LEWIS MUMFORD
JONATHAN MITCHELL

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What Sanctions Have Meant to Italy

AFTER spending three weeks in various parts of Italy, I have absolutely no doubt that the struggle between Italy and Ethiopia will go on to the bitter end. How bitter that end will be, only Italian bankers and business men know. Even now Italy's finances are in a state bordering on collapse. If the war goes on side by side with sanctions, until the rainy season in Ethiopia begins *(i.e.,* early this spring) there is every reason to believe that the economic position of Italy will be such that it will take her many years to recover from the collapse and chaos brought on by the war and by sanctions.

The Fascist government in Italy has ceased publication of all figures of the gold reserve at the Bank of Italy since October. State revenue and expenditure figures are no longer published either. Both these suppressions were made by decree and for very good reason: because of the alarm such publication would arouse. The fact is that in 1930 the Bank of Italy had about ten billion lire of gold reserves. These reserves had sunk in August, 1935, to five billion lire and are now estimated at about three billions. Leading financiers in Rome and in the North expect the gold reserves to be reduced to one billion lire early in the present year. These are the naked facts. Is there any explanation?

Today in Italy every rise in the cost of living, every rise in unemployment, every distress in the economic life of the nation, is attributed to Great Britain. When I arrived in Milan on the day that sanctions first came into force, I found chalked up on a hundred walls "Eden pig," "Eden ox," "England is disgusting," "Francia troia" (France prostitute) and a great deal more in the same vein. The application of sanctions against Italy by some fifty members of the League of Nations has provided a target for the profound economic discontent that has been seething in Italy for the past two years. Everything today is blamed on sanctions, and sanctions mean England to 95 percent of the population in the peninsula. A rare voice here and there suggests that the government, Il Duce himself, is the real cause of Italy's economic distress by the huge program of unremunerative public works and by a still huger corporative bureaucracy that has to be fed and clothed and is unproductive. This program—in other words, the price of dictatorship which since last October includes a tremendously expensive war, estimated by some at fifty million paper lire daily—has brought Italy low, say these critics. World economic depression played its part, but Mussolini took no steps to meet it. He

People who hold such views and support them with careful figures are, of course, quite unable to voice their opinions in Italy today. The penalty for being overheard in a café saying such things is immediate arrest and trial by the special Tribunal for the Defense of the State, with a sentence of two or more years' imprisonment. If you tried to publish any criticism along these lines, you would have to print it yourself and face discovery and an exceedingly heavy sentence.

I have stated these views here only because they exist. Whether they are true or not is still of no consequence in modern Italy. What matters perhaps is that some serious-minded and responsible people hold them; but what matters more is that the vast majority of Italians believe something entirely different. They are told, and they believe it, that Great Britain is seriously menaced by Italy's rightful expansion in Ethiopia; that England was nervous at the beginning of 1935 when she saw M. Laval in Rome and the likelihood of a Franco-Italian agreement; that she then put the whole League machinery into motion to make a League case out of what was legitimate Italian action in guaranteeing the safety of her colonies of Eritrea and Somaliland from Ethiopian raids and incursions; that Great Britain in the Paris conversations last summer never offered Baron Aloisi any serious proposition in Ethiopia, but suggested Italy should take over portions of the Danakil and Ogaden that are largely desert regions.

Finally Great Britain is accused of seriously wanting Mussolini's downfall and of planning the ruin of Italy as a rival in Africa. Asked how Italy could become such a rival, the Fascist answer is: "Great Britain believes that once we have conquered Ethiopia, we might arm a million black troops there, and these would be the finest fighting force in Africa, and would of course border on the Sudan and Kenya."—This being a true picture of the concentrated hatred of Great Britain in Italy today, it is not surprising to find all foreigners, and especially Anglo-Saxons, having a thin time of it in Italy. Hundreds of English people who have lived in Florence and in Rome for years, have left. Those who have remained are there either by reason of their work as diplomats, journalists, bank clerks, chemists' assistants and business men who are waiting for sanctions to end, or else they are British residents who have publicly declared themselves out of sympathy with the League policy and have brought gifts of gold and metals to the local Fascist federal secretary as proof of their loyalty. There are no tourists at all: there are a few

HOSTED BY TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the country: small (or more rarely, serious) manifestations of Anglophobia. An English woman long resident in Rome was publicly insulted in a china shop and told she could carry home her purchases. The shop would certainly not send them. A Scotsman staying at one of the big hotels near the Villa Borghese in Rome is being served last at every meal and has his food thrown at him rather than brought to him.

At a council school in Rome, on the day sanctions came into force, the boys and girls in the English class planned a mass attack with penknives and pens from their desks on the English priest who taught them. He was to be their target, but he rushed out before any damage was done. The girl from the school in question told me, when I asked her about it, that the headmaster had not reprimanded the children in any way. Every morning before school begins, there is a talk on sanctions.

With due regard to Italy's claims in Ethiopia, and with careful consideration of the previous neutrality of the League of Nations in the Japanese invasion of Manchuria, in the Chaco War between Paraguay and Bolivia, and in Germany's rearmament (every Italian will remind you bitterly of these facts, in case you have forgotten them); with due regard to the impression so often gained in Germany and in Italy that the League is a league of the "haves" designed to preserve the status quo in Europe and in the world, whatever the hopes and rights of the "have-not" nations may be; in spite of all this, and there is truth in it, the present mood in Italy grossly exaggerates the importance of England, and probably misconstrues the League's policy in such a way as to create an almost totally topsy-turvy picture of modern Europe, and, what is more important in this case, of Italy's own position in that Europe.

Talk of the League of Nations in Italy today and you will be met by indulgent smiles, or rather by a sort of sarcastic smirk. It means nothing in an Italian's life: but then Europe has ceased to have any real meaning in Italian foreign policy. Go back farther and you find in Italy today absolutely none of that genuine anti-war feeling that is shared, I believe, by ordinary American, British and French citizens from one end of their respective countries to the other. Twelve years of violent incitement to become a valiant and fully trained nation ready for any emergency, and twelve years of intensive military training of the youth of the country, are only now bearing fruit in Italy.

Italy, at war with Ethiopia, is engaged in a struggle that no other European power has ever attempted, and that Egypt alone (among the African states) partially undertook a hundred years ago and then failed. The British attack in the last century was a punitive expedition, although it resulted in the reigning Emperor's suicide. No one, given a well equipped army, it would take several years at least to achieve such a conquest.

I saw trains in Naples arriving from different places in Italy, troop trains filled with young volunteers. Palm and laurel leaves covered the carriages, and every door bore a chalk inscription, "A Addis Ababa." Suddenly, with a roar, all the young heads would lean out of the windows, yelling "A qui l'Abyssinia?" and another roar would answer from the train and from the civilian men and women in other trains, "A noi!" (To whom does Abyssinia belong? To us!")

Who are these 245,000 young men who have gone out to East Africa?

I know that when I was in Italy exactly a year ago, very few people either knew or dreamed that such an enormous expedition was being planned. At that time, unemployment was at its height and business in a bad way. Probably the winter of 1934-35 saw the real crisis in Italy. Only then was the economic slump felt to the full. The United States and Great Britain had received the blow much earlier, owing to less rigid conditions of trade, and were already planning recovery.

In Italy the unemployed of that awful winter of yesterday are the East African volunteers of today, and they were sent off on a Holy War. Mussolini said to them: "Remember you are armed colonists. You will have your land there, and you will bring civilization to a savage country as the Romans have always done." (I quote from memory.) As armed colonists they went. One hundred thousand of them are married. Their wives and children are expecting to go out soon and settle down with a cow and chickens on coffee or cotton plantations. How many people outside Italy know this? Yet it is true. Everywhere I found the same description of the war: "Italy's population increases by a half million yearly, because all emigration to the United States and to South America is virtually stopped. Italians must have an outlet, and this is their New Deal. This is how we in Italy see our future. It's the best we can do when the rest of the world is closed to us, and the League denies us any colonial mandates."

The war has entailed a tightening up of belts all around. The bare truth is that Italy could ill afford it. American and other business men in the spring of 1935 already were refusing to sell on a big scale to Italy, because Italian debts were too long-termed and payments frequently unsatisfactory. A kind of unofficial sanction against exports to Italy was already in operation. Now the League sanctions that operate against all Italian exports to the fifty nations who have adopted sanctions (with a few reservations on the part of Switzerland) are dealing the final blow.

All over Italy men, women and children are giving gold, trinkets, jewels, medals and wedding

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these gold rings at local ceremonies. Approximately one to two billion gold lire might be coined out of these gifts at a favorable guess. Old iron and lead are being brought as gifts to the nation by every school child: in Naples one little boy in his enthusiasm, and to the consternation of his mother, took the house key and presented it to the country.

The sale of meat is forbidden on three days of the week. On those days you have what are called "sanction meals," and delicious they are!—in a land where the finest dishes are made of macaroni, rice, pastry and poultry. Prices of staple foods are still kept low by the summary closing of shops that refuse to stick to the government price list. Eight such shops were forcibly closed recently in Rome, for periods ranging from one to four weeks. Butter, I noticed, was still obtainable at reasonable prices; but oil, a more important commodity to the Italian, was rising by *centesimi* every week. Vegetables were ever plentiful, and fruit of a quality hitherto used for export is now to be found at very low prices in the markets. Sanctions will not "starve Italy out," nor was that ever their intention. There are no sanctions on Italian imports of foods, only on war materials; nevertheless, the government has had thousands of posters and cards printed about "the nations who want to starve us," and these are prominently displayed in all the shops.

Where sanctions are keenly felt is in the Italian export business. This is at a standstill, but through that useful though dangerous device, the censorship laws, this situation is never mentioned. I found about half of the Italians I met quite unaware of the sanctions on all Italian exports. Export sanctions have affected shipbuilding, a growing Italian industry, as well as the orange, lemon and tomato industry in Sicily. As regards the import of iron and ferro concrete, its stoppage has dislocated the building industry. Thousands of men have been thrown out of work, for the government has had to prohibit all new building operations.

The motor industry is also at a standstill. With gasoline selling at more than a dollar a gallon, traffic in all the towns has been reduced by 70 percent. Oddly enough, this affects the Fascist official as keenly as anything in the present situation. He has to lay up his car and face the wrath of his wife and family to whom the *macchina* was still a sign of distinction. The Fiat and Alfa Romeo factories are busy making munitions, but large numbers of mechanics and chauffeurs are losing their jobs.

It is difficult to estimate how much of Italy's electric power is made by coal. Most of it is, of course, generated by water, but enormous savings in street lighting have just been put into operation. Rome goes half-dark every night at 10:30, and a small town like Siena is barely lit at all. Coal is not yet on the sanctions list, but it may yet be there, and even if it should not, coal like oil has to be abroad to pay for these expensive commodities and there is very little gold at home, as we have seen.

The Church has staked everything on Italy's resistance to sanctions. Every bishop (though there may be some exceptions) has offered his episcopal chain and gold cross to the nation. Peace is not preached from Catholic pulpits in Italy today, but a sense of the injustice done to Italy is fostered, and God's help is asked to show the world how wrong it is. The Catholic Church perhaps nowhere else in the world enjoys such a privileged position as it has under Mussolini's regime. It is naturally grateful and wholehearted in its support of that regime in a crisis like the present one.

Side by side with the genuine patriotism shown by Italians of all classes, there is a marked flight from the lira in Italy. People are buying land, jewels, anything rather than hold spare paper money. There is a somewhat catastrophic atmosphere about this orgy of spending.

Meanwhile, everyone wants to know what is going to happen. Is Mussolini going to be overthrown? Is Germany going to help Italy? There has been much talk of Italy getting all the raw materials she needs from Germany, who is not a member of the League. But Germany needs her iron, coal and steel in her own huge rearmament program and can ill spare the quantities Italy now requires. And the critical question of payment still remains. Unless Il Duce goes off his head and orders an attack on the British fleet, there is little likelihood of Germany's being involved in this controversy, and even then she would probably preserve her neutrality. Will Mussolini be overthrown? No, the chances are against it. He is the hero of the hour in Italy today, and if he negotiates a peace, he can make that peace seem a victory in the eyes of his people and he can carry them with him into the long years of recovery—if, indeed, he has envisaged a stern program of recovery.

Alone in Italy today, the bankers and business men realize the gravity of the situation, and Italy is not essentially an industrial country, so that these bankers and business men count for far less than they would in the United States or in Great Britain. Nine million Italians work on the land: only three millions work in industry.

I have not mentioned the continual talk of "war with England" that I heard from one end of Italy to the other. Such a war would be short and fatal to Italy, partly because neighboring League members like Jugoslavia and France would be involved, but those who know Mussolini intimately cannot exclude wild and sudden actions from his behavior. The Fascist regime in Italy must work itself out of its own internal muddles. It may die in the process, and be replaced by a military dictatorship, but pressure from outside is too much like a red rag to a bull. It only roars more furiously and attacks,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Justice Roberts and Justice Stone

The following article, which takes the place of Mr. Flynn's regular department for this week, is based upon the opinion, and the dissenting opinion, of the Supreme Court in the A.A.A. case. The dialogue reproduces faithfully, for the most part, the precise words of the two opinions; a few minor changes of a word or a phrase have been made to adapt the material to this form or to shorten it. The spectator's inquiry is introduced to clarify the obscure language of the Court on two occasions. The object of the article is to render plain and make readily available the heart of this epoch-making decision.—THE EDITORS.

MR. JUSTICE ROBERTS: The government contends that under Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution the Congress has the power to levy this tax (*a tax on processors of farm products to pay benefits to the farmers*). The clause which the government thinks authorizes the legislation—the first clause—confers upon Congress the power "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and exercises to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and *promote the general welfare of the United States.*"[1]

Now as we see it, this is the great and controlling question in this case. And we approach its decision with a sense of our deep responsibility to render judgment in accordance established for the governance of all three branches of the government.

(Observing a deprecatory grimace on the face of Mr. Justice Brandeis):

No misunderstanding, please! We know it is sometimes said *(with a glance toward Mr. Brandeis)* that the Court assumes a power to overrule or control the action of the people's representatives. This is a misconception. When an act of Congress is challenged in the courts as not conforming to the constitutional mandate, the judicial branch of the government has only one duty—to ascertain and declare whether the legislation is in accordance with or in contravention of the Constitution.

Mr. Justice Stone: True. But while the unconstitutional exercise of power by the executive and legislative branches of the government is subject to judicial restraint, *the only restraint upon our own exercise of power is our own sense of self-restraint.* For the removal of unwise laws from the statute books appeal lies not to the courts but to the ballot and the processes of democratic government. *(Tense silence.)*

Justice Roberts: Let us get on!

Hamilton maintained that the taxing and general-welfare clause confers a power separate and distinct from those later enumerated, that Congress has the power to tax and appropriate limited only by the requirement that it shall be exercised to provide *for the general welfare of the United States.*[1] This court agrees with this.

Justice Stone: Well, with the present depressed state of agriculture, which is nationwide, there is certainly no basis for saying that the expenditure of public money in aid of farmers is not within the specific grant of power to Congress to levy taxes "to provide for the general welfare," is there?

Justice Roberts: We are not now required to ascertain whether an appropriation in aid of agriculture falls within this grant of power.

Justice Stone: Then you don't decide on that point.

Justice Roberts: No, we do not.

Justice Stone: Then it is not denied that Congress in aid of the general welfare may make an appropriation in aid of agriculture?

Justice Roberts: We neither affirm nor deny.

Justice Stone: Then on what ground do you outlaw the tax?

Justice Roberts: There is a difference, let me remind my learned colleague, between making an appropriation "in aid of agriculture" and adopting a plan—of which the tax is merely a part—*to regulate agriculture.* The right to regulate agriculture is reserved to the states. It was never granted to the federal government. That being so, it is an established principle that the attainment of a prohibited end may not be accomplished under the pretext of the exertion of powers which are granted.

The power of taxation, which is expressly granted, may of course be adopted as a means to carry into operation another power also expressly granted. But resort to the taxing power to effectuate an end which is not within the scope of the Constitution, is obviously inadmissible. This court has held this over and over since Marshall laid it down in McCulloch v. Maryland. Therefore the taxing power may not be used to enforce a regulation of matters of state concern with respect to which the Congress has no authority to interfere.

Justice Stone: But how is Congress regulating agriculture here?

Justice Roberts: Not having the power to regulate agriculture, Congress undertakes to purchase that power by paying benefits to farmers for compliance which Congress is powerless to command. Congress has no power to enforce its commands on the farmer to the ends sought by the Agricultural Adjustment Act. It must follow that it may

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Justice Stone: But the farmer is placed under no legal compulsion to reduce acreage.

Justice Roberts: That's what the government contends, that its end is accomplished by voluntary coöperation. But it is not in fact voluntary. The farmer of course may refuse to comply, but the price of refusal is the loss of benefits. The amount offered is intended to be sufficient to exert pressure on him to agree to the proposed regulation.

Justice Stone: But it is threat of loss, not hope of gain, which is the essence of economic coercion.

Justice Robert: The power to confer or withhold unlimited benefits is the power to coerce or destroy. If the cotton grower elects not to accept the benefits he will receive less for his crops. Those who receive payments may be able to undersell him. The result may well be financial ruin.

Justice Stone: There is nothing to indicate that those who accepted benefits were impelled by fear of lower prices. After all, look at what actually happened. Fourteen percent of all acreage of cotton land—6,343,000 acres—refused to participate the first year and six percent the second. One-third of all the cotton farms in 1934 and 13 percent in 1935 did not participate.

Justice Roberts: The coercive purpose of the A.A.A. is not obscured by the fact that it is not perfectly successful.

Justice Stone: Well, the suggestion of coercion finds no support in the record or in the data showing the actual operation of the act. The presumption of constitutionality is not to be overturned by an assertion of its coercive effect which rests on nothing more substantial than groundless speculation.

The Constitution requires that public funds shall be spent for a defined purpose—the promotion of the general welfare. Their expenditure usually involves payment on terms which will ensure use by the recipients within the limits of the constitutional purpose. Expenditures would fail of their purpose and thus lose their constitutional sanction if the terms of payment were not such that by their influence on the action of the recipients the permitted end would be attained.

A Spectator: Whoa there, Mr. Justice! Let me see if I get that. To achieve the general welfare the funds raised must be paid out by the government to individuals and those individuals must use the money for the purpose intended by Congress. Unless the money is spent for that purpose the constitutional objective—the general welfare—will not be attained. Hence payments are usually made upon condition that they will be used as intended or they will lose their constitutional sanction. Therefore payments are usually conditional.

Justice Stone: Quite right. Thank you for the translation.

Justice Roberts: Of course I know it is contended that much of the total expenditure by Congress is made by appropriating money to executive officers for expenditures under contracts for proper governmental purposes cannot justify contracts which are not within the federal power.

A Spectator: Pardon me, Mr. Justice Roberts. Do I understand your contention to be this: that Congress may tax and spend on declared purposes for the general welfare? And that these purposes may not be within the powers of the federal government under any of its special grants of power? But that if conditions are annexed to the payments of money they must be for performance in a field over which Congress has control?

Justice Roberts: Precisely. And contracts for the reduction of acreage and the control of production are outside the range of that power. The Congress cannot invade state jurisdiction to compel individual action; no more can it purchase such action.

Justice Stone: Mere annexing of a condition to a payment of money by the government cannot be called usurping regulation. The power of Congress to spend is inseparable from persuasion to action over which Congress has no control. Congress may not command that the science of agriculture be taught in the state universities. But if it would aid the teaching of that science by grants to state institutions, it is appropriate, if not necessary, that the grant be on the condition, incorporated in the Morrill act, 12 Stat. 593, that it be used for the purpose intended.

"Let the end be legitimate," said the great Chief Justice Marshall. "Let it be within the scope of the Constitution and all means which are appropriate, which are plainly adapted to that end, which are not prohibited, but consistent with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are constitutional." This cardinal guide to constitutional exposition must now be rephrased so far as the spending power of the federal government is concerned.

Let the expenditure be to promote the general welfare; still, if it is needful in order to ensure its use for the intended purpose to influence any action which Congress cannot command because within the sphere of state government, the expenditure is unconstitutional.

Congress through the Interstate Commerce Commission has set aside intrastate railroad rates. It has made and destroyed intrastate industries by raising or lowering tariffs. These results are said to be permissible because they are incidents of the commerce power and the power to levy duties on imports. The only conclusion to be drawn is that results become lawful when incident to the similarly granted power to tax and spend.

The limitation now sanctioned must lead to absurd consequences. The government may give seeds to farmers, but may not condition the gift upon their being planted in places where they are most needed, or even planted at all.

The government may give money to the unemployed, but may not ask that those who get shall

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

earthquake, fire, tornado, pestilence or flood, but may not impose conditions—health precautions designed to prevent the spread of disease or induce the movement of population to safer or more sanitary areas.

The government may spend its money for vocational rehabilitation, but it may not, with the consent of all concerned, supervise the process which it undertakes to aid. It may spend its money for the suppression of the boll weevil, but may not compensate the farmers for suspending the growth of cotton in the infected areas.

It may support rural schools, but may not condition its grant by the requirement that certain standards be maintained. It may appropriate moneys to be expended by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation "to aid in financing agriculture, commerce and industry" and to facilitate "the exportation of agricultural and other products."

Do all its activities collapse because, in order to effect the permissible purpose, in myriad ways the money is paid out upon terms and conditions which influence action of the recipients within the state, which Congress cannot command? The answer would seem plain. If the expenditure is for a national public purpose, that purpose will not be thwarted because payment is on condition which will advance that purpose.

Justice Roberts: We are referred to numerous types of federal appropriation which have been made in the past and it is asserted no question has been raised to their validity. We need not stop to examine or consider them. As was said in Massachusetts v. Mellon, "As an examination of the acts of Congress will disclose, a large number of statutes appropriating or involving the expenditure of moneys for federal purposes have been enacted and carried into effect." As the opinion points out, such expenditures have not been challenged because no remedy was open for testing their constitutionality in the courts.

But we are not here concerned with conditional appropriations. . . . By the A.A.A. the amount of the tax is expended only in payment under contracts whereby the parties bind themselves to regulation by the federal government. There is an obvious difference between a statute stating the conditions upon which moneys shall be expended and one expended only upon assumption of a contractual obligation to submit to a regulation which otherwise could not be enforced.

Justice Stone: The action which Congress induces by payments of money to promote the general welfare, but which it does not command or coerce, is but an incident to a specifically granted power, but a permissible means to a legitimate end. If appropriation in aid of a program of curtailment of agricultural production is constitutional, and it is not denied that it is, payment to farmers on condition that they reduce their crop acreage is constitutional. It is not any the less so because the farmer at his

Justice Roberts: If the act before us is a proper exercise of the taxing power, then the regulation of all industry throughout the United States may be accomplished by similar exercises of the same power.

A possible result of sustaining the claimed federal power would be that every business group which thought itself underprivileged might demand that a tax be laid on its vendors or vendees, the proceeds to be appropriated to the redress of its deficiency of income.

The expressions of the framers of the Constitution and the great commentators will be searched in vain for any suggestion that there exists in the Constitution the authority whereby every fair implication from that instrument may be subverted; the independence of the individual states obliterated and the United States converted into a central government exercising uncontrolled police power, superseding all local control or regulation of the affairs of the states.

Justice Stone: That argument—that the power of Congress must be curtailed by judicial fiat because it may be abused by unwise use—hardly rises to the dignity of an argument. *(Looking fixedly at Mr. Justice Roberts):* So may judicial power be abused.

Justice Roberts: Strange, it seems never to have occurred to the framers of the Constitution that the general welfare of the United States (which has aptly been termed an indestructible union of indestructible states) might be served by obliterating the constituent members of the Union.

Justice Stone: A tortured construction is not to be justified by recourse to extreme examples of reckless congressional spending which might occur if courts could not prevent expenditures which, even if they could be thought to effect any national purpose, would be possible only by action of a legislature lost to all sense of public responsibility. Such suppositions must leave unmoved any but the mind accustomed to believe that it is the business of courts to sit in judgment on the wisdom of legislative action.

Courts are not the only agency of government that must be assumed to have capacity to govern. Congress and the courts both unhappily may falter or be mistaken in the performance of their constitutional duty. But interpretation of our great charter of government which proceeds on any assumption that the responsibility for the preservation of our institutions is the exclusive concern of any one of the three branches of the government, or that it alone can save them from destruction, is far more likely, in the long run, "to obliterate the constituent members" of "an indestructible union of indestructible states" than the frank recognition that language even of a Constitution may mean what it says: that the power to tax and spend includes the power to relieve a nationwide economic maladjustment by conditional gifts of money

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Without Work Experience"

What Uncle Sam Is Doing for the Nation's Youth

WHEN, LAST June, Mr. Roosevelt announced the formation of the National Youth Administration, it became quickly evident that he had touched upon one of the deepest anxieties of the country. In perhaps a third of all families, parents were living with children who lacked the normal prospects of jobs and marriage. Many young men and women were becoming resentful, despairing, impossible to manage. With the President's words, a great surge of hope arose from parents and the teaching profession.

The failure of this hope to be realized, in any large degree, has tended to set the country against the N.Y.A. Strictly speaking, this is unfair. In his original announcement, Mr. Roosevelt committed himself to aid for no more than 500,000 youths of the total of 5,000,000 unemployed. However, in the widespread newspaper acclaim that greeted the creation of the N.Y.A., this limitation was lost sight of. Unquestionably, the country took the N.Y.A. as a pledge that the youth problem would be much more vigorously attacked than, in fact, it has been.

The inadequacy of the N.Y.A.'s program was perceived first by youth itself. The N.Y.A. was hardly established before it was condemned by most left-wing youth organizations, often in bitter terms. Even from orthodox youth groups, it has received little praise. Its day-to-day functioning has been repeatedly criticized. It has been inordinately slow in putting its limited program into operation. So far, its principal achievement has been to continue the aid given college students a year ago by the F.E.R.A. The N.Y.A. has suffered greatly from last summer's feud between Hopkins and Ickes, with its resulting delays and confusion in the general $4,000,000,000 relief program. Youth projects are only now being decided on, and it will be weeks before the N.Y.A. program will reach its maximum.

A final serious handicap has been dissension within the N.Y.A.'s ranks. The N.Y.A. began existence with a contest for jurisdiction between Aubrey Williams, its director, and John W. Studebaker, Commissioner of Education—a contest that was not lessened by the fact that Williams was first assistant to Hopkins, and Studebaker's chief was Ickes. School teachers, as a group, sided with Studebaker, and his gradual defeat served to alienate them. The feeling of teachers toward the N.Y.A. is illustrated by an article of Willard E. Givens in the Journal of the powerful National Education

As things now stand, the N.Y.A. is perhaps less important than the evident determination of the country to find a thoroughgoing solution of the youth problem. Among teachers, this feeling has already led to action. With $800,000 pledged by the Rockefeller-financed General Education Board, a committee has been set up to mobilize all available teaching experience. Owen D. Young, one of the committee's members, has had lengthy conversations with Mr. Roosevelt, and is presumed to have enlisted his interest. From teachers, parents and youth groups we shall soon be hearing lively discussions of youth and its difficulties.

Last spring Mr. Roosevelt had to choose among three youth programs submitted by the F.E.R.A., Dr. Studebaker and the Labor Department, respectively. In outward form, all were substantially alike. All provided for keeping as many youngsters as possible in school, for sending as many as possible to the C.C.C. camps, and for giving the rest jobs on relief projects vaguely associated with youth interests. The animus behind the plans, however, was quite different. Hopkins and Williams were chiefly concerned in rescuing young men and women from home relief. Since the days of the C.W.A., the F.E.R.A. has endeavored to create jobs for the unemployed of the same kind as those they had in 1929. Month by month, however, Hopkins and Williams had watched the growth of a new classification on F.E.R.A. report sheets: W.W.E.—"Without Work Experience." These were young men and women who had come of working age since the crash. There was no proper place for them in the F.E.R.A. scheme of things, except in the rare instances where they were heads of families. The youth program proposed by Hopkins and Williams attempted to remedy this lack.

The emphasis in Dr. Studebaker's program, not unnaturally, was on education. Among other things, it provided for the creation of several hundred local educational centers, or "youth councils," for purposes of administration. Dr. Studebaker had shortly before come from the Des Moines, Iowa, public-school system to the Office of Education. He was a frequent caller at the White House, and it is possible that he felt he had presidential support behind him. His program, at any rate, was by far the most elaborate submitted, calling for an expenditure of approximately $25,000,000 a month, in contrast to the $50,000,000 for a whole year that the N.Y.A. has in fact received.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

until older workers with families could be absorbed into private employment. In addition, certain officials of the Labor Department wished to experiment with the provisions for apprenticeship in private industry which were formulated under the N.R.A., but have never really been put into practice.

Mr. Roosevelt's decision to give the N.Y.A. to Aubrey Williams has meant that the chief emphasis has been placed on relief. Various educational authorities, including Dr. George D. Strayer of Columbia University, have questioned whether or not the N.Y.A. represents an effort by the Roosevelt administration to control the thinking of youth. Such accusations have been ridiculed by Charles W. Taussig, head of the N.Y.A.'s advisory board, and, given the character of Hopkins and Williams, the ridicule is justified. They are altogether preoccupied in seeing that young men and women eat and have sufficient clothing. They have only a general academic interest in what youth is thinking, or whether it thinks at all. What the N.Y.A. might become in other hands, however, is a different question.

The N.Y.A. is limited to three main jobs. It gives aid to college students. It gives money for carfare and incidentals to high-school students. It approves work-relief projects on which the labor of young men and women can be utilized to advantage. In point of funds expended, the most important is the college program. It has already been pointed out that this is a continuation of the aid given by the F.E.R.A., quite without publicity, during 1934. The N.Y.A. is now helping 104,501 undergraduates in 1,602 institutions, with a monthly disbursement of $1,559,645. The comparative figures for last year were 94,308 undergraduates in 1,465 institutions, with a monthly disbursement of $1,414,595.

You may recall that last year Dr. Tyler Dennett of Williams College resoundingly declined an F.E.R.A. grant. He considered it an insidious means of obtaining control over the colleges, much as Dr. Strayer and others now fear that the N.Y.A. will control youth in general. Many Eastern colleges have followed the example of Williams in declining government funds, among them Harvard, Yale and Princeton. The Princeton Theological Seminary, however, accepts $345 a month from the N.Y.A., [illegible] Yale departments unobtrusively take

cases, undergraduates receive $15
hich they are required to perform
ful work prescribed by the college
thorities. They are paid at pre-
metimes only 30 or 35 cents an
on an average, from eight to
eek. Fifteen dollars a month is
to permit the child of a relief
ege. Even if it is assumed that

his tuition free by virtue of a scholarship, $15 a month is not enough to pay for room rent, clothes, laundry and books—at least not without hardships likely to endanger health. The N.Y.A. college program is only for the children of families substantially above the relief line.

The N.Y.A. also gives aid to graduate students, the allowances for whom may be as much as $20 or $25 monthly. Grants are made not on the basis of needy applicants, however, but on the enrolment in each institution's graduate departments. Thus the graduate allotment for Howard University happens to be $80 monthly, and the Howard authorities have spread this among eight candidates for masters' degrees and doctorates, or $10 a month apiece. Since Howard is perhaps the chief intellectual center of the Negro population of the country, this seems less than munificent on the part of the government.

Under the high-school program, the allotment for each student is $6 monthly. This program, in distinction to that for the colleges, is designed purely for members of relief families. With grim optimism, it is assumed that the family relief check covers the child's food, clothing and shelter. The program owes its origin to the reports of relief-administration case workers that children were quitting high school for lack of carfare or some minor article of clothing. In large cities, for reasons of inexcusable economy, high schools are generally of monstrous size and widely separated, and a walk of four or five miles through crowded streets has often been too great for half-starved youngsters. Similarly, the humiliation of wearing ragged dresses and shirts, and broken-out shoes, particularly in the case of girls, has been more than children could bear. The $6-a-month grant is to remedy these difficulties.

Under the original plan, children were supposed to perform useful work, as in the college program, for their $6. This requirement has now been largely abandoned, partly because the work of a janitor around high schools is often political patronage, and political appointees resented children chiseling in on their jobs. In a number of instances, high-school authorities have been reluctant to accept N.Y.A. grants at all. To some degree, the grants involved the school system in relief, and this the authorities shrank from. Slightly less than 200,000 high-schools students are now being aided by the N.Y.A.; exact figures are not available.

The N.Y.A.'s program of youth work projects has a total allotment of $20,000,000. This compares with $27,000,000 being spent on educational assistance. There are four main classifications of work projects: urban recreation, employing 55,000; rural recreation, employing 20,000; government apprenticeships, employing 15,000, and government research, employing 4,000, or a total of 94,000 jobs. The [illegible]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which adults are also working, they will receive "security" wages, but will be permitted to work only a third of an adult's hours, and draw only a third of his pay.

By far the best feature of the work program is that a youth will be permitted to earn money without regard to whether his family is receiving relief funds from other sources. It is unobjectionable for youths of high-school age to be dependent on their parents, but when they are more than eighteen, an intolerable situation is likely to be created. Parents on relief usually resent the sight of these adult-sized boys and girls around the home; the youths, feeling this hostility and knowing their own eagerness for jobs, smart under the sense of injustice. In the practical functioning of the N.Y.A.'s work program, jobs will be given primarily to children of large families, whose pay will inevitably go to eke out the family income. Nevertheless, even where youths cannot keep any of their wages for their own purposes, the consciousness that they are contributing to the family support will be of immense psychological value.

Because of the unending delays in the N.Y.A.'s program, regional conferences to approve work projects are only now being held. However, the general character of the projects can be predicted. In the last few years, many communities, alarmed by the deterioration in their young men and women, have undertaken an amazing variety of youth activities. Apparently the N.Y.A. intends to continue and extend such spontaneous community ventures, and not embark on new projects of its own. Parenthetically, it may be remarked that these community activities deserve more attention than they have yet had. They form the best evidence of the national determination to force a solution of the whole youth question.

Under the urban-recreation program, a favorite project is likely to comprise cleaning up vacant lots, with the permission of the owners, and transforming them into neighborhood playgrounds. The building of playgrounds in public parks in most cases will fall under the W.P.A., but small park projects may go to the N.Y.A. Once recreational facilities exist, the N.Y.A. will teach youth how to take advantage of them. These projects will employ so-called youth leaders and sub-leaders, who will supervise classes in a bewildering number of vocational and leisure-time subjects. In general, this instruction will follow orthodox social-work lines. Rural-recreation projects will resemble those of the urban program, except that they will include a greater amount of vocational training—in prevention of soil erosion, use of fertilizers and reforestation.

The government-apprenticeship projects arise, in part, from Mr. Roosevelt's genuine desire to create a professional civil service, long suppressed out of [illegible] State and [illegible] side the government—is urgently

youths in the ordinary governmental departments. Among other things, they will be set to making traffic checks, aiding in parole and juvenile-delinquency work, and assisting agencies for health and public welfare. The hope is that through this experience young men and women will acquire a taste for government service and make it their career. The experiment seems likely, however, to turn youths into aspiring ward-heelers rather than civil servants of the type common in Europe. Government-research projects are of the same kind, and consist largely of unearthing and arranging records of vital statistics and local laws.

In addition to the meagerness of its payments to individuals, and the fact that its program will not reach more than a tenth of those needing help, the chief criticism to be brought against the N.Y.A. is that it is doing nothing to hasten a final solution of the youth problem. This is partly an unfair accusation, for the N.Y.A. repudiates the idea that it is a policy-making body. Moreover, it must be recognized that all those who fear government domination of education would strenuously oppose its becoming one. Nevertheless, some sort of leadership is required in the present situation, and the N.Y.A. is the chief youth agency we have.

A part of the eventual solution, for example, will probably be the raising of the age for leaving school to eighteen years. By its $6-a-month allowance to high-school students, the N.Y.A. is aiding in keeping children in school. However, it is making no effort to face the immense problem of changed curricula that will be made necessary by an increase in the school age, nor is it encouraging teachers to draft solutions of their own.

Another part of the problem concerns vocational training. The dangers concealed in vocational-training programs now being carried on by many states were revealed in the recent report to Secretary Perkins and Commissioner Studebaker made by Anna L. Burdick and Ruth Scandrett, who found both misuse of government funds and exploitation of apprentice labor. Vocational training is obviously an extremely critical question, yet the N.Y.A. is making no attempt to give the country a lead on what policy should be followed.

A third decision that must be made is whether it is not better for the nation's stability that young men and women, upon reaching adulthood, have first chance at jobs and marriage, ev[illegible]
place workers in middle age. The
F.E.R.A. and the N.Y.A. is to enc
employers to take older workers, b
find any other basis for this policy
ton's fear of antagonizing the votin
youth problem is nationwide, and
wait indefinitely. It is possible t
ought not concern itself with broad
is so, then some other agency—eit'

LICENSED TO GNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Canadian Report

THIS IS the city of Toronto, called "Toronto the Good," or "Tory Toronto." It is the second largest city in the Dominion, the spiritual and financial capital of English Canada. Don't ask for a French restaurant, or mention the Gaspé. French Canada simply doesn't exist. It is as though you spoke of Cousin Nellie, who was such a nice girl—too bad she took up with that coachman and had that baby. The family looks pained, but never mentions the subject. Don't worry. Quebec reciprocates.

The Methodists run Toronto. The Church of England skims the social cream, but the Methodists are far superior in numbers, money and influence. They have combined with most of the Presbyterians into the United Church of Canada. They set the tone of the town. There are no Sunday movies. There are not even Sunday newspapers. Marriage is solemn, and until two years ago a literal Act of Parliament was required to obtain a divorce.

This is the city called "Toronto the Good." Even newspapermen don't swear in Toronto, and the Rotary Club opens its meetings by drinking a toast to the King—in water. Some of the customs are odd, but the streets are safe. You don't have to lock your automobile in Toronto. Nobody will steal it, or the packages in it. The food is middle-class, mid-continent and exceptionally good. Toasted crumpets, dripping with butter, damson jam and superlative tea cost 15 cents. Table d'hôte dinners may be had for 35 to 65 cents. A Canadian tips five cents, and makes no bones about it.

The Scotch are the dominant race—Scotch and Scotch-Irish. These and the English and Irish make up a population almost wholly United Kingdom. You can walk for miles, blocks, hours, and never leave Great Britain. There are some foreign elements, to be sure, but they are neatly packeted—Toronto fashion—in their own little districts, and they stay in their packets. A Toronto Tory would as soon be seen dead as to be caught in one of the "low-class" or "foreign" districts. The local political organization is dominated by the Irish—but they are Orangemen. They hate Catholics and celebrate the battle of the Boyne. Protestant clergymen form the backbone of the Coöperative Commonwealth Federation (outgrowth of the Socialist Party) in Toronto, and the Communists are Scotch.

Toronto is comfortable, stuffy and Victorian. The accent is more American than English, more Middle West than Eastern Seaboard. One expression is striking. They use "good night" as a greeting—just as you might say "good morning" or "good evening" they say "good night." Anglicisms persist: labour, honour, colour, etc., retain the "u" and the last letter in the alphabet is called zed.

Liquor laws in Ontario are unbelievable nonsense. Ontario would like to be dry, tried it, and found the evils of bootlegging too much to endure. Now you buy spirits only by bottle and only in government stores. Wines and beer are served by the glass and then only in bona-fide hotels—no bars or restaurants. A hotel is defined as an establishment with at least six sleeping rooms. You can imagine how six-room hostelries are blooming in Canada.

This is only the beginning of complications. There are at least five classes of hotel public rooms in which liquor may be served: gentlemen's beer parlor (men only, no women, no food, beer and ale only); women's beer parlor (women alone, men if accompanied by women, beer and ale but no wine, no food); main dining room (men and women, women alone or men alone, food obligatory, beer, ale AND wines, including champagne); men's snack room (men only, light lunches, beer and ale but no wine); summer gardens (men and women, men alone, women alone, beer and ale but no wine, no beer without food)—the whole thing becomes a madhouse. Beneath this hysterical maze, however, is a realistic purpose to make liquor available legally, and to encourage the use of beer and wine in place of more potent spirits.

The Canadian Babbitt is more international-minded than his American cousin. That's because of the British Empire. The pull is strong, in spite of Canadian nationalism and Dominion independence. You feel the force of all this hocus-pocus about "the crown as a symbol of Empire unity." A kindly old gentleman and his not-too-smart wife in colored photographs. They suit Toronto right down to the ground.

Times are getting better in Canada—on the surface. The whole British Empire is looking up. Now that Mr. Bennett is out and Mr. King is in and the trade agreements are signed, politics can rest a while and business should go along undisturbed. This war scare looks pretty bad, but maybe it will blow over. If the Empire goes in, Canada probably will follow her. But let's cross that bridge when we come to it. What Canada needs now is a chance for business to go ahead and develop the country. That's what Tory Toronto thinks.

There are some boys in the "slave camps" of Canada who are not so sure. These are the local equivalent of the Civilian Conservation Corps. The Canadian boys get 20 cents a day, military discipline, and see little or no hope of resuming their place in normal economic life. Last summer they started a march from Vancouver to Ottawa, and were turned back at Regina with machine-gun bullets. There are 4,000 men being interned for the winter in Dundurn Compound in Saskatchewan who haven't received much benefit from the existing system. There is an aroused electorate in the western provinces, now chasing a Social Credit will-o'-the-wisp, but quite capable of being turned into more realistic channels. There are clergymen, professors

LICENSED TO ZZZ BBB
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ately intent upon a greater measure of social justice. There are sturdy Scotch Communists, standing rocklike in anticipation of the coming class struggles.

These people don't register much on the surface of life in Ontario. They must seem a nondescript herd to the placid Victorians so comfortably in power. Yet it is just possible that the future of Canada may rest in their hands—in spite of Tory Toronto.

Toronto. T. R. CARSKADON.

Forming a People's Front

FOR SOME reason to which intelligent man is not privy, the usual diet at most conventions consists chiefly of oratory and windy speech-making. In this respect, the third Congress of the American League Against War and Fascism, which met in Cleveland, Ohio, on January 3, was conspicuously and refreshingly different. This was a congress dedicated to work—to the serious task of organizing workers, farmers and professionals in common defense of their democratic rights, in a united front against another war. With the nations of the world rushing military preparations at a terrifying pace and with the forces of reaction smashing civil liberties as never before, there was a grim realization among the delegates of the urgency of their meeting. The American Legion, as usual, denounced the congress as "Communist-inspired," but it could not criticize the delegates for wasting their time breaking hotel crockery or staggering drunkenly about the streets.

There were two things especially significant about this congress: The great diversity of the groups represented and the striking unity of thought and action among them. Altogether, there were 2,287 delegates, representing 992 organizations with a total membership of 1,907,560. These figures leave little doubt that the anti-war, anti-fascist movement, though still young and relatively small, is gaining steadily in numbers and in influence. This is perhaps most clearly reflected in the trade-union delegation, which was both larger and broader than the one at the second congress of the League in 1934. It included representatives from every basic and principal industry in the country. Of the more than 400,000 workers represented, 348,350 were in 149 locals and central bodies of the A.F. of L. The increased participation of the A.F. of L. unions was noteworthy in view of the letter written by President William Green warning them that there were Communists among the League's members—as though the League had ever tried to keep this horrible fact a secret.

The success of the League depends, of course, on its ability to enlist all elements in the country that are opposed to war and fascism. Its progress in this direction is shown in part by the various 16,850 members; church and religious, 36, with 60,330 members; civil-rights and defense groups, 13, with 209,215 members; educational, 44, with 7,615 members; farm, 18, with 57,310 members; political parties, 4, with 42,085; professional, 25, with 22,330; women's organizations, 63, with 99,810; youth groups, 160, with 45,160. Workers' clubs, fraternal organizations and social clubs made up most of the remainder. Geographically, twenty-nine states and five foreign countries—Cuba, China, Japan, Mexico and Canada—were represented.

It was a picturesque assembly and, no doubt, to the casual observer, an incredibly heterogeneous one. Yet when the time came to decide on a program of action for the coming year, the delegates spoke with a single purpose. They recognized war and fascism as twin evils stemming from a common root, capitalism. In realistic fashion, therefore, their program places small faith in the ability of capitalism or capitalistic governments to prevent war. It calls, instead, for the building of a powerful body, not unlike the People's Front in France, alert and ready to resist the forces of militarism and reaction wherever they show. Cleveland was an important stage in the building of such a front.

The congress opened with a mass meeting in the Cleveland Public Auditorium, which was packed with some 10,000 people—an unprecedented number, according to local newspapermen, for a meeting of this sort. Cleveland is a city in which workers have felt police clubs and in which May Day parades have been banned by the officials and broken up by vigilantes. But a change appears to have taken place. Mayor Harold H. Burton, former country commander of the American Legion, made the welcoming address, despite vigorous protests from the patrioteers. He sat on the platform with Earl Browder, general secretary of the Communist Party. The Cleveland newspapers were a pleasant surprise. All three—The Press, The News and The Plain Dealer—reported the proceedings fairly and generously, compared with the usual treatment such affairs receive. Two of them carried editorials commending the congress to their readers. "The discussions," said The Plain Dealer, "should contribute much to the enlightenment necessary if war and fascism are to be successfully combatted." Edna K. Wooley, in her column in The News, urged all Clevelanders to attend the mass meeting and declared that "It's time the PEOPLE organize for peace and learn to understand and reject the powers which bring about war."

The major portion of the three-day congress was devoted to the work of the various commissions set up on the opening day. These commissions—trade-union, farm, educational, religious, etc.—heard the reports of the delegates, considered the specific problems of the interests represented and formulated plans of action for the coming year. The

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

American Civil Liberties Union and the Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners. From these it learned that at least forty-nine workers were killed in strikes and other economic struggles last year. More than sixty political prisoners are now awaiting trial or serving terms of a year or more, solely because of their labor or anti-war activities.

To the delegates, confronted with this and other evidence of oppression, the class struggle was no academic theory but a poignant fact of every-day life. For here were the unmistakable signs of the "forming pattern of American fascism," as Dr. Harry F. Ward, chairman of the League, termed it. "The real fascists," he declared, "are organizing. The Chamber of Commerce works for the most vicious gag laws in our history, the Liberty League prates about the Constitution while the Bill of Rights is being smashed, the Hearst press stirs up hate against the 'Reds' so they can be ruled off the ballot, flung into jail and be clubbed by ignorant and corrupted police."

There can be little question that it was this forming pattern of fascism, coupled with the increasing threat of war, that made the congress the most significant in the League's history. It was this that produced such impressive unity among groups which, by any other measure, would appear hopelessly divided. During the first two years of its life, the League was handicapped in its growth because of the suspicion held by some that it was merely an instrument of the Communist Party. But it now seems reasonable to say that these suspicions have proved groundless and that the League has emerged from this period of distrust. It is clear by now that the Communist Party's interest in the League is only in seeing that it becomes the largest and broadest front possible against the common menace of war and fascism. It is particularly significant that the Socialist Party, after withdrawing from the League for the past two years, has approached it once more with an offer of coöperation in the organization of a special anti-war, anti-fascist body among the trade unions. This offer, presented to the Congress by Paul Porter, official representative of the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party, was unanimously approved. It marks the first step to a broader unity than has hitherto been possible. The great question is whether such unity can be built speedily enough. Will the League's congress be a full-grown people's front or will another war come first?

Cleveland. WILLIAM P. MANGOLD.

Bird-Witted

With innocent wide penguin eyes, three
grown fledgling mocking-birds below
the pussy-willow tree,
stand in a row,
wings touching, feebly solemn,
till they see
their no longer larger
mother bringing
something which will partially
feed one of them.
Towards the high-keyed intermittent squeak
of broken carriage-springs, made by
the three similar, meek-
coated bird's-eye
freckled forms she comes; and when
from the beak
of one, the still living
beetle has dropped
out, she picks it up and puts
it in again.
Standing in the shade till they have dressed
their thickly-filamented, pale
pussy-willow-surfaced
coats, they spread tail
and wings, showing one by one,
the modest
white stripe lengthwise on the
tail and crosswise
underneath the wing, and the
with rapid unexpected flute-
sounds leaping from the throat
of the astute
grown bird comes back to one from
the remote
unenergetic sun-
lit air before
the brood was here? Why has the
bird's voice become
harsh? A piebald cat observing them,
is slowly creeping toward the trim
trio on the tree-stem.
Unused to him
the three make room—uneasy
new problem.
A dangling foot that missed
its grasp, is raised
and finds the twig on which it
planned to perch. The
parent darting down, nerved by what chills
the blood, and by hope rewarded—
of toil—since nothing fills
squeaking unfed
mouths, wages deadly combat,
and half kills
with bayonet beak and
cruel wings, the
intellectual cautious-
ly creeping cat.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

Roosevelt Refuses to Make the Court an Issue—How the Campaign Funds Stand—Big Business Bids for the Government

THE PERIOD immediately following Mr. Justice Roberts' decision outlawing the A.A.A. was one of teeth-gritting on the part of administration officials. Portions of the decision—as when Roberts spoke of "coercion by economic pressure"—were regarded as a gratuitous fling at the administration, and there was a general impulse to answer back. However, it had been previously decided that nothing should be said or done to make the Supreme Court an issue in the coming campaign, and this resolution was adhered to with surprising discipline. Mr. Roosevelt and Secretary Wallace seemed to bear the strain easily, but the tempers of lesser administration leaders underwent a severe test.

The circumstances under which Mr. Roosevelt decided against raising the constitutional issue remain a mystery. At the time of the Schechter decision last spring, he apparently favored a constitutional amendment increasing the scope of the federal government's powers. Later it was reported that, while still favoring an amendment, he was undecided whether to make it a campaign issue. Then, about the time of his "breathing-spell" letter to Roy W. Howard, word came that all thought of an amendment had been abandoned. If this decision is final it represents a surrender of a large part of the New Deal objectives.

In the gush of news caused by the Supreme Court's axe-blow at the A.A.A., the financial statements of the Republican and Democratic National Committees and the American Liberty League have been lost sight of. Nevertheless they are worth attention. Big business men seldom give up money without a motive, and, in the case of contributions to the 1936 presidential campaign, their motive is control of the government during the next four years.

During 1935, in contributions and loans, the Republican National Committee raised $407,454; the Liberty League, $483,175. Since the Liberty League is frankly an anti-Roosevelt body, it is legitimate to add its funds to those of the Republicans, giving an anti-Roosevelt total of $890,629. A little more than one-fifth of this total, or $183,349, came from members of the du Pont family, or from concerns, like General Motors, in which they are interested. Ernest T. Weir, of the National Steel Corporation, the first big employer to challenge the old Wagner Labor Board, together with relatives and business associates, gave $35,000, and J. Howard Pew, of Sun Oil, and his group, $30,000.

What commitments have been given by Republican Party bosses in return for contributions they alone know. But the manner in which campaign funds are normally solicited is no secret. Generally there is a dinner at a big-city club, given by a lawyer who makes his living by acting as intermediary between big business and the party bosses. The lawyer suggests that "the boys" need a little cash. Very rudely, Big Businessman A—— says that politicians are the [illegible] preferably a horrid lull ensues. Then Big Businessman B—— says that, while all Republicans and Democrats appear to be Communists, or worse, he personally would give $1,000 if a candidate could be found with just one drop of old-fashioned common, or horse, sense. Upon which, the gathering descends to brass tacks. The host, on behalf of the party bosses, gives assurances on candidate and platform, and the big business men write out their checks.

Inevitably, if he wins next fall's election, the Republican presidential candidate will find himself urged by the party bosses to listen to the suggestions of the du Ponts, Weirs and Pews regarding the members of his Cabinet and his legislative program. Almost certainly he will find that, without his knowledge, specific pledges have been made to big business. Unless he is man of more courage and spirit than anyone whom the Republicans are likely to nominate, he will let himself be convinced that these pledges should be redeemed, and his administration will be compromised before he takes office.

It is hardly surprising to find that big business has already given nearly $900,000 to the anti-Roosevelt group. But, in view of the hostile outbursts of the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce, it seems odd to find big business also contributing heavily to reëlect Mr. Roosevelt. For 1935, in loans and contributions, the Democratic National Committee reports $525,635, or about 60 percent of the combined total of the Republicans and the Liberty League. Among the 158 individuals giving from $1,000 to $10,000 to the Roosevelt fund, you find: M. L. Benedum, oil operator; S. F. Boykin, Coca Cola; Adolph and Otto Bremer, American National Bank (St. Paul); Howard Bruce and Percival E. Jackson, Worthington Pump and Machinery; F. Buttram, Buttram Petroleum; Barron Collier, advertising; Henry C. von Elm, Manufacturers' Trust (New York); J. Fletcher Farrell, Consolidated Oil; P. A. S. Franklin and Basil Harris, International Mercantile Marine; A. P. Giannini, Bancamerica; S. Parker Gilbert, J. P. Morgan and Company; Albert M. Greenfield, Bankers' Bond and Mortgage (Philadelphia); W. W. Hoffman, National City Bank (New York); William E. Levis, Owens-Illinois Glass; Cyrus H. and Harold F. McCormick, International Harvester; James E. Sauter, Bloomingdale-Prince; Percy S. Straus, R. H. Macy and Company (now retired); Sidney J. Weinberg, Goldman, Sachs.

Partisan rivalry seems to exist between General Motors and Chrysler. A number of General Motors officials, in addition to the du Ponts, are contributors to the Republican and Liberty League funds. Walter P. Chrysler and his two chief executives, B. E. Hutchinson and K. T. Keller, have placed their money on Mr. Roosevelt. Fred J. Fisher, head of the Detroit Fisher clan and once powerful in General Motors, is also a Roosevelt contributor. Partisanship similarly divides the chemical industry. William B. Bell, of American Cyanamid, is head of the Republican finance committee. W. R. Perkins, of the same company, gave $5,000 to the Republicans, and Edward M. Queeney, of Monsanto Chemical, gave $2,500. However, Mr. Roosevelt can claim Ashley T. Cole, M. J. Barney and R. O'Shea of Union Carbide and Carbon, F. B. Adams

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Robert F. Carr of Dearborn Chemical. For readers of society pages, it may be noted that Mr. Roosevelt has the support of Joseph E. Davies, former member of the Federal Trade Commission; the Liberty League, however, is supported by his recent bride, Mrs. Marjorie Post Hutton Davies. Mrs. Davies' former husband, Edward F. ("Gang up on 'Em") Hutton, lent, not gave, $5,000 to the League.

At the opening of Congress, Mr. Roosevelt made the brave boast that he had "brought the federal government back to the city of Washington"—that he freed the government of the influence of big business. Yet Mr. Roosevelt cannot be ignorant of the effect of big-business contributions upon an administration. In 1932, he himself was forced to make many appointments at the behest of the large contributors to his campaign fund. The late William H. Woodin, secretary of the Treasury, General Hugh S. Johnson of the N.R.A., and George W. Peek of the A.A.A.—although Mr. Roosevelt was personally fond of all three—were nominees of the big-money Democrat group, and received the three key positions of the administration. Possibly Mr. Roosevelt, absorbed by his multifarious duties, is unaware that business groups are again being solicited for funds for the 1936 campaign. However, there is a danger that he will discover that, despite the fact he has brought the government back to Washington, the Democratic bosses have sold options on it.

Washington. T. R. B.

Best Neglected Film

NOW WHILE the general excitement of picking the one, the ten, the how-many-hundred best pictures is still hot upon us, I wish to urge the case of the absolutely best neglected picture of two years, "The Captain Hates the Sea." After having made it boldly, the film's producers (Columbia) lost heart very early, the rumor got around that it was a flop before the print arrived, the bookers booked half-heartedly, the exhibitors exhibited even less so, the press quite naturally assumed that nothing so modestly presented could be at all funny, and that was that. The best reports made it show so poorly that I never bothered with it until it was too old for review, over which I have been uneasy ever since and in expiation of which I hereby establish something like Malcolm Cowley's conscience fund for book reviewers.

As to details, Wallace Smith wrote the story, Lewis Milestone directed, and they had the longest list of comedy players I remember seeing: John Gilbert, Walter Connolly, Fred Keating, Alison Skipworth, Victor McLaglen, Helen Vinson, Leon Errol, Walter Catlett, Donald Meek, Luis Alberni, Akim Tamiroff, Arthur Treacher—they had practically everything but the Bronx telephone directory and Lady Gregory. But in spite of its being packed with talent the film was weak in big-drawing stars—and it had a worse weakness from the point of view of popular appeal: it lacked a definite story.

In pictures there seem to have been two main types of successful comedy: one where the plot is more or less subordinate to or transcended by the performer (W. C. Fields, the Marx Brothers, Ma W[illegible]

ordinate to some other interest, either that of action ("The Thin Man") or of sentiment (from the Capra films to such weak stuff as "Ruggles of Red Gap"). But let a producer once get off these beaten tracks, get a little satirical, or hard-boiled, or flippant with the wrong things, and out in the country they will not be amused. In fact some of a person's best friends in comedy—"Twentieth Century," "Sing and Like It," the Hecht-Lubitsch "Design for Living"—have gone out in the country and met up with the great national blank pan. It is very sad. And then along comes "The Captain Hates the Sea," not only a departure from the safe cycles but a picture without a plot, an informal, non-homey, so-what sort of picture. Sadder.

The picture starts with John Gilbert leaving his girl to get on a ship and clear of Hollywood, to sober up and write a novel; it ends with his coming down the gangway, still handsome and still high, to fall into the girl's car in New York. This rather delightful comment on human intentions is not enough to make a picture: the picture is made by what goes on in between these terminal points—incidents, entanglements, hails and farewells—all coming somehow through the atmosphere of John Gilbert's quiet bun, hazy, mellow, unreal but not to be surprised at.

Walter Connolly as captain gets the picture off on its proper foot immediately: "I de-*test* the sea," he says in exasperation to a bunch of reporters. He detests also the whole mess of gabble-gabble passengers, and if the old crate doesn't hold together for the trip he won't be surprised and it might interest them to know he won't be sorry for it. Like to see any damnfool women and children beat him into a lifeboat, he break them in two with his own hands—slack off on your forward lines, mister—and what is more—two-thirds ahead both engines—and what is more where is that damnfool steward. Leon Errol is the steward, and he owns a terrific bugle bird and the captain can't find out from him what's going on in his own ship, even a fire. McLaglen is aboard from a private agency, to put handcuffs on Fred Keating, who would steal your socks though politely, and whose accomplice is Helen Vinson, who literally steals McLaglen's. Alison Skipworth is always sitting at her corner table and foiling the bartender horribly by eating the lemon peel out of her horse's neck; and practically everybody is one of the boys—except Donald Meek, who rouses in the captain a lust, hidden since boyhood, to get a man with a beard leaning over his soup on one elbow, and knock the elbow out from under (his old man ate soup with a beard and it's why Walter is at sea); and the English major, who has a terrific lust to hit the bass drum in one of the most weary and delicious steamer orchestras ever seen (Jerry and Moe Howard, and Larry Fine).

The people are natural, the situations they get into proceed naturally from them and from each other, and are carried out with an ease of direction that is as simple and right as the principle of cantilever, so that everything matches with the dominant mood of good temper, gentle mockery, droll high spirits and edge. Practically everything, that is: there is in the picture's disfavor a queer confusion that shows from time to time, and strikes a particularly jarring note in the firing-squad business, the pitiful case of a man's having married below him and going practically crazy

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it some time—it has gone under ground. But in support of its right to a better life I submit that, after more than a year, I can recall with affection and recite to the extreme irritation of friends entire sequences, almost by the dozen, about the captain and the steward and the bird and the whiskers, the flatfoot, the smooth gentleman, the whiskey-sodas and pretty moll.

But about comedy. I saw this one in company once with a small-town audience, once with a rather selected New York audience; and both times the audience not only laughed but laughed pretty constantly, in the right places and from the right region, which I believe is the diaphragm (*cf.* belly-laugh, gut-bucket, etc.). Those audiences were not fooling, they were practically in the aisles. But did the film get any word-of-mouth build-up? It patently did not, and I think I can tell you why: it had no elevation. No readings from the classics, no moral from life. In fact, nothing at all. And so the critics and plain people went away with a weak back from laughing, and feeling good —but also feeling deprecatory. And so we must conclude that in spite of a definite genius for laughter, we like the English are really ashamed of falling for anything that is nothing but fine, free and funny, that makes you laugh and makes you feel good but does not balance an ounce of open fun with a pound of betterment. We want to eat our cake and have it certified as oatmeal too, and what I say is: out upon any such pack of mental percivals—and more particularly out upon the general run of its critics, those knaves and solemn humbugs, duly appointed certifiers by virtue of God knows what. OTIS FERGUSON.

CORRESPONDENCE

Congress and the Supreme Court

SIR: In your issue of December 18, you have a communication by Joseph L. Lewinson on "Congress Rules the Supreme Court," pointing out that Congress has the power to regulate the appellate jurisdiction of that Court and so to prevent its ruling on the constitutionality of legislation.

Very well. Let him answer this: Suppose that a federal judge in Maine finds an anti-child-labor act of Congress constitutional, while a federal judge in Texas finds to the contrary. Will the act be constitutional in Maine and unconstitutional in Texas? Who shall decide?

Article III, Section 2, states, "The judicial power shall extend to all cases arising under this Constitution." What inferior court shall decide whether or not the instant case arose under the Constitution or extra-constitutionally? Whether the "law" involved is in accordance with the Constitution or contrary to it?

If neither inferior nor Supreme Court has the power to make such decision, then the judicial power of the courts does not extend to all cases, and judicial power resides in part elsewhere; perhaps in Congress or in the majority of Congress, which could then soon outlaw the Constitution and effect peaceful adjustment of the social order, if it would.

St. Paul, Minn. A. W. UHL.

SIR: My short letter dealt with the power of Congress to limit judicial review, not with the policy of exercising that power. In the language of the Supreme Court, every inferior federal court "derives its jurisdiction wholly from the authority of Congress." No informed person would advocate limiting judi- [illegible] the Supreme Court and leaving it unrestricted in [illegible] Court "with such exceptions, and under such regulations as the Congress shall make."

The British Constitution has not been "outlawed." For two hundred years no English court has undertaken to exercise jurisdiction to review Acts of Parliament. Even without statutory limitations upon its jurisdiction, the Supreme Court has declined to take jurisdiction of some constitutional questions, *e. g.*, questions arising under Section 4 of Article IV, which guarantees to every state a republican form of government.

Referring to the power of Congress "to make exceptions to the appellate jurisdiction," Marshall himself declared: "These exceptions certainly go as far as the legislature may think proper for the interest and liberty of the people."

JOSEPH L. LEWINSON.

Los Angeles, Calif.

A Word on the Northwest

SIR: Every once in a while The New Republic publishes something which "gets me in a big way," as "Roses in January; Morons in June" in the issue of December 18. Perhaps it is *Heimweh* for the Paradise of the Pacific Coast, perhaps it is provincial pride to find that a rather cosmopolitan observer sees a great future for the West—even though it is pretty cheap and nasty and cruel and exploitive at present. My faith, no, not quite my faith but rather a forlorn hope, is that we may develop a sufficiently sane and sound social order soon enough to prevent the completion of the gutting of the West that is so well under way.

Of course, when I say West, I mean the Northwest. It has not been so filled with Midwestern scum, Eastern fakers, "successful" Bourbons and other odorous gentry. If we include Utah and Idaho, as we should, I could show you places to match Mr. Bliven's Santa Ysabella canyon, and also a thousand other places of mountains, islands, lakes, river and rocky coast that would incite you.

Miami University, Oxford, O. READ BAIN.

From The New Republic Mail Bag

David Mills of Brooklyn, New York, takes issue with H. N. Brailsford in his article, "British Press and British Policy," in The New Republic for January 1, 1936. Mr. Mills thinks that the attitude of the British press in supporting the government in the Ethiopian crisis was not so much a matter of government manipulation as it was the almost automatic result of the traditional Empire-mindedness of the average Englishman. . . . Dr. S. J. Cantor sends from Melbourne, Australia, a booklet outlining his plan for a Commonwealth of Nations with an international police force to maintain order.

William S. Maulsby, editorial director of the American Institute for Public Opinion, wishes to correct a misstatement in the article, "Where Roosevelt Stands Today," by Jonathan Mitchell, published in the issue of November 13. In that article, the American Institute of Public opinion was described as "a private organization serving newspapers and advertisers." Mr. Maulsby writes that it does not serve advertisers in any way, and "its only function is to prepare a weekly report on nationwide public opinion on one issue a week for a list of newspapers now numbering fifty-one."

In response to great public interest in the article in the November issue of Fortune Magazine giving a digest of the recent studies of Harold G. Moulton, president of the Brookings Institution, in which Dr. Moulton advocates lower prices for manufactured products, a special reprint of this article has been made and will be sent free to anyone writing to the Maurice and Laura Falk Foundation, Farmers' Bank Building, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

From Oakland, California, comes news of an effort to establish a labor college on the Pacific Coast. A number of influential labor leaders and socially minded citizens are interested in the project and headquarters have been established by the Western Labor College Association at 5837 San Pablo Avenue, Oakland, California.

Walter C. Leck of Closter, New Jersey, writes a trenchant

LICENSED TO NZ.ORG ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS IN REVIEW

Monsieur de Montherlant

WITHOUT becoming a novelist of international importance, Henry de Montherlant has gone beyond Proust by adding a final chapter to the decline of the French nobility. Proust had portrayed it in a state of violent disintegration, given over to conflicting self-interests and sexual perversions. In Montherlant's new novel, "Perish in Their Pride,"[1] there are no conflicts, no violence: the nobility gropes forward gently toward its final extinction in the peace of the tomb.

The Coëtquidans and the Coantrés, two families that traced back their ancestry to the Crusades, had dwindled to three surviving members, all aged but immature, all childless and sexually impotent. Baron Octave de Coëtquidan was a banker, rich because he had been pushed forward by a rich friend, but essentially stupid and empty and ignorant of the world. Baron Elie de Coëtquidan was a miser who wandered through the streets in a threadbare overcoat held together by safety pins and read his newspaper by the light from shop windows. Count Léon de Coantré, their nephew, was a good-natured simpleton of fifty, capable only of mowing the lawn and clipping the hedge. After his mother's death he had no money, and his two uncles let him die of neglect and starvation. To this situation—one would scarcely call it a plot—Montherlant devotes three hundred leisurely pages of psychological astuteness and sour wisdom. The best scene is very good indeed—the death of poor Léon, last of the Counts of Coantré, deserted by his relatives and calling out in a terrible voice for the not very devoted servant whom he had discharged because he couldn't pay her wages. "Mme. Mélanie, stay with me! I don't want to die alone!" It is as if he were gasping out the epitaph of that whole class to which Montherlant himself belongs.

Under the title of "Les Célibataires," the book was widely praised in France. But it is like those delicate and thin-bodied wines that lose their bouquet when jolted in trains: it is not a good traveler. Half of its strength is in the style, which cannot be carried over into English in spite of the translator's conscientious efforts. The characters are too indigenous to be assessed at their real value by a foreign audience. As for the story itself, it is less eventful and has less meaning to the world than the life story of Henry de Montherlant, the aristocrat and soldier and athlete who became a man of letters.

In more than one fashion he is the French counterpart of Ernest Hemingway; it is easy to draw a series of parallels between them. Thus, both enlisted in the army at an early age and were seriously wounded by exploding German shells; they came out of the War with an unsatisfied thirst for danger and a vast irresponsibility. Both took up sport as a moral substitute for fighting: Hemingway boxed and fished, seriously; Montherlant played soccer, ran in the 100-meter dash and was ingenuously proud of almost breaking records. Both went to Spain and eruditely studied the art of killing bulls with a sword-thrust between the horns. Both wrote a war novel and a book on bull-fighting; both were famous before they were thirty. And the parallels extend into the very spirit of their work. Both men write about themselves with candor, both have abused the literary masters they used to copy, both have a reverence for the act of taking life. "It is natural that those killed by others should set your nerves on edge, but the most hideous corpse becomes a thing of beauty when it is you who are the killer," Montherlant says in his war novel. It reminds you exactly of Hemingway addressing the animals he has slaughtered in "Green Hills of Africa."

But these parallels, which could be developed at much greater length, are less important than the differences between the two men. Unquestionably Hemingway is sharper and more original: he approaches his material from a new angle and cuts into it deeply enough to find its core of universal truth. Montherlant is more insular: he bears indelibly the marks of his French training. Often we are told that the French are by nature a rational people, but the truth is that French schoolboys of the prosperous classes have rationality poured and pounded into their stubborn heads; they cannot be graduated from a *lycée* until they have learned to make generalizations and seek for a philosophical principle behind their actions. When these actions are like those of Montherlant, when they depend on a taste for danger, death and voluptuous self-sacrifice, the principle by which they are rationalized may prove to be false and inflated.

Some years ago, Montherlant proclaimed a personal philosophy, one for which his professors at the *lycée* would have commended him. He said that two principles have long been struggling for supremacy in Europe. "The one, feminine in its genius, is based on the unverifiable. . . . Of Oriental origin, it engendered Utopia, which begot disorder. Alexandrianism, Byzantinism, Protestantism, revolution, romanticism, bolshevism, such are its offspring. On its seal is engraved a heart. The other principle, virile, rational and founded on nature, fosters order and stability. . . . It inspired Roman Catholicism, the Renaissance, tradition, authority, classicism, nationalism." To this second, or Mussolinian, principle he proclaimed his utter loyalty.

It happens that there is now a conflict in France, not exactly between Montherlant's two principles, but rather between the small people and the patrioteers, between the idea of liberty and equality and, on the other hand, the idea of tradition and class domination. Judging from his record, you would expect Montherlant to be supporting the Fascist Leagues and even joining in street brawls against the proletariat. On the contrary, he has been speaking and writing in behalf of the People's Front. . . . Is this a case of personal conversion, another vision like Paul's on the road to Damascus? There has been a real change in the man, but I doubt that it is enough to explain the new line he is taking. Chiefly his opposition to fascism is a testimony to the strength of the popular forces. He continues to admire virtues like bravery, enterprise, unreasoning devotion, which used to be associated with the Blackshirts and the young Storm Troopers. But to look for these qualities among the French patrioteers—that rabble of pedants, policemen, impotent bachelors, noblemen with empty pockets and captains of commissary retired on half pay—is like hunting for eagles in a canary-bird cage. To find even the

LICENSED TO GALE GROUP
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Road to Revision

Life and Letters of Woodrow Wilson. Volume V, Neutrality: 1914-15, by Ray Stannard Baker. New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company. 420 pages. $4.

THIS BOOK would seem to confirm a rumor that reached my ears many months ago to the effect that Mr. Baker was delaying his many-volumed life of President Wilson because of his profound shift of feeling about the righteousness of the American course in international politics following June, 1914. As finally issued, the book is an explicit, extensive and forthright document of the "revisionist" school of thought about our entrance into the World War. It takes into account all of the arguments advanced by the revisionists and sustains most of them. While still an official life of President Wilson, it does not spare the hero when the hero needs critical attention. On the other hand, it is clearly a rebuttal, and in some instances a definitive rebuttal, to the biographers of Walter Hines Page and Colonel E. M. House, and by implication it makes Robert Lansing appear in the role of a disloyal servant. Of the official group around the President only one increases in stature and that one is the same person the revisionists selected for aggrandizement: William Jennings Bryan.

Mr. Baker firmly grasps the essential difficulty of the Wilson administration with regard to the War: how to control powerful economic forces working to entangle us in it when the only policy available was political and legalistic in nature. Mr. Baker contends that Wilson and Bryan agreed that the proper course was to control the economic forces tightly, and cites the Bryan "opinion" on the essentially unneutral nature of public loans to belligerents issued in 1914. But hard economic necessity required the slow abandonment of such a course. First there was the need of relieving an economic depression in this country by opening up the channels of export, and then when that had been done it was discovered that the nation had become the chief base of supplies for the Allied powers. For this reason, the delivery of goods to the Allies was the basis of a vast and artificial prosperity with which no political leader dared tamper. Indeed the political leaders—chief among them William Gibbs McAdoo, Secretary of the Treasury—were under constant pressure to guarantee that prosperity by removing the ban on loans which had become necessary to finance the mounting volume of transactions. McAdoo transferred this pressure to the President, who gave in during October of 1915. From that moment, as Mr. Baker correctly remarks, our foreign policy "was reduced to futility." We were tied to the Allies; our already shattered neutrality no longer had even the semblance of reality.

In telling this story in all its aspects—diplomatic, personal, propagandist—Mr. Baker has occasion to put several eminent gentlemen in their places, especially the biographers of Page and House. In a scarifying passage he refers to "our most important representative on the firing line, actually taking the part of our chief diplomatic opponent, playing the game of the British [Page]; and Colonel House . . . being used by the Allies as a pawn in their deliberate and most effective policy of delay." He also makes a point of the fact that House did not have any warrant from Wilson to conduct his crazy undiplomatic negotiations with the British and further contends that Wilson was so preoccupied with House's most important accomplishment, a conditional promise of American participation in the War on England's side, in a fashion that completely destroyed its purpose.

Mr. Baker's evidence would seem definitely to put Messrs. Hendrick and Seymour, and their defenders like Sidney Bradshaw Fay, in a box—where they belong—and the box is labeled, "Contains special pleaders. Handle as roughly as possible." For this reason alone, the fifth volume is the most important of the series, and redeems the whole from the charge of stodginess to which, until this moment, there was no adequate reply.

C. HARTLEY GRATTAN.

Behind the Trademark

Eat, Drink and Be Wary, by F. J. Schlink. New York: Covici, Friede. 322 pages. $2.

MR. SCHLINK'S new book has the customary virtues of Consumers' Research literature, together with some grave weaknesses. "Eat, Drink and Be Wary" is a brilliant exposure of food adulteration, but its excursions into theories of nutrition are marred by exaggeration, intemperateness and food-faddism.

Mr. Schlink objects strongly to current theories of dietetics, which insist on liberal quantities of milk, raw fruit and leafy vegetables—the so-called protective foods. He insists that a diet of meat, fish, eggs and cooked fresh fruits and vegetables is all that anybody needs, provided that these foodstuffs have not been robbed of their natural vitamins and minerals. But the director of Consumers' Research is not content to demonstrate that the protective foods are far from indispensable. He has a thesis to maintain—and accordingly he discovers that milk and leafy vegetables are indigestible and that the calcium content of milk is overrated. At this point he comes into direct conflict with the United States Public Health Service, which declares that milk is one of the most digestible of foods and, because of its mineral content, is unequaled as a tooth and bone builder.

Mr. Schlink is on sure and more familiar ground in his attack on those who are debauching the nation's food supply. Women's-magazine nutritionists and the university scholars who for hire partake in the task of creating a demand for packaged, processed, refined and trademarked foods come in for equally bitter denunciation. Nor do the bigwigs in nutrition escape. Professor E. V. McCollum of Johns Hopkins gets a drubbing for lending his name and prestige to the white-bread trust—a strange alliance, when one remembers Dr. McCollum's books, in which he points out that white flour is "notably more deficient in more dietary factors than any other food."

With an abundance of evidence Mr. Schlink demonstrates that the American consumer must be wary in eating and drinking. His fruits and vegetables are coated with the residue of poisonous lead and arsenic insecticides. His unripe oranges are dyed by ethylene gas to a bright orange to simulate maturity. His bread is composed of egg and yeast substitutes and acid-bleached flour, fortified with chemicals to prevent staling. His ice cream is not only contaminated with bacteria but artificially pumped full of air (sold at the price of cream). His processed cheese is a product of the chemist's skill with emulsifiers added to "improve" low-grade ingredients. From every side a con-

ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prices under corporate trademarks. Every such sale not only gives the consumer an inferior article but narrows the market for farmers' products.

Is there a way out for America's guinea pigs? Mr. Schlink does not propose a legislative solution. He has seen the food and drug lobby in action. He urges instead a return to the diet and uncorrupted food instincts of grandmother's day, a solution that will seem utopian to millions of city dwellers far removed from sources of fresh foods. Nowhere in this book does Mr. Schlink suggest that consumers should organize to fight for the protection of their food supply.

WILL MASLOW.

Dead End

Guillotine Party and Other Stories, by James T. Farrell. New York: The Vanguard Press. $2.50.

PERHAPS the most terrifying aspect of the Studs Lonigan trilogy was the mindlessness of it. In spite of some literary clumsiness the author did achieve an absolute: the honest depiction of mediocrity could go no further. The writing went on and on with the same accents for broken heads and belly-aches and death, and after a few hundred pages the reader was either anesthetized or hysterical from so much accumulated ugliness. Unfortunately—because one would like to like more and more of Mr. Farrell's work—when people have been hit on the head a certain number of times they become insensitive to blows. Some twelve hundred pages of Studs may make one more or less immune to the best of Mr. Farrell's short stories, which continue the monotonous brutality of the trilogy. The author's limitations are particularly apparent when he is attempting definition and perspective, as in the original Studs sketch printed in this book of short stories. So Studs is a slob, and we knew it all the time, and the Fifty-eighth Street gang is pretty dumb, pretty commonplace, and we knew that too, and we wonder whether Mr. Farrell isn't coming to the end of a dead-end street.

The finest story in the book is "Jo-Jo," in which the old mindless Farrell material is disciplined into a kind of sharpness, horrible because of the ease with which filth and boredom and horror can take possession of a man. "Two Sisters" is equally stark. It is a picture of two loud-mouthed Irish women, shrieking, cursing, falling into each other's arms. Such writing is painful, it can only come out of profound disgust, but the author remains an impersonal medium. One has a feeling that the raw facts have been torn out of him and thrown on the page. On the other hand, when he intrudes with generalizations, as he does in most of this book, the characters become stilted vehicles for not very illuminating thought. They begin to say "whom" and "on the other hand" and lose their substance with their grammatical mistakes. "Reverend Father Gilhooley" conveys only the *fact* of corruption in the Church. Here, and in "The Benefits of American Life," there is no flashlight, nothing revealed. The author is at his worst when reporting, quite seriously, the inanities of left-bank *artistes* (not mere artists if one takes them at their own evaluation), and at his best when he is presenting the paralysis of the lower-middle class, as in "Wedding Bells Will Ring So Merrily." For those who are not acquainted with Studs Lonigan, the lack of drama in this story of a young married salesman will be as shocking as any [illegible] tragedy. Mr. Farrell is on [illegible]

"Go Farther Than I Went!"

If It Die: An Autobiography, by André Gide. Translated by Dorothy Bussy. New York: Random House. 331 pages. $5.

FEW AUTOBIOGRAPHERS have avoided both the Scylla of exhibitionism and the Charybdis of self-justification. Rousseau's masterpiece constantly oscillates between these two extremes; after Rousseau, a great number of writers have attempted, with greater or less skill, to hide the bad odor of confession under the accumulation of "objective" and tedious details. Obviously, Gide is of a different caliber; he has succeeded in transforming the story of his childhood and adolescence into a classical account of the inner struggles that the majority of artists must undergo in order to conquer themselves, wrest themselves out of their environment.

The atmosphere pervading Gide's formative years seems to have been particularly stifling. His mother, who had charge of his education, was an unselfish person, entirely devoted to what she believed was good for her only son; but her stiff, narrow-minded morality made her unfit to understand his temperament. She did everything in her power to thwart his inclinations and to inculcate in him her own sense of arid duty. Deprived of the normal pleasures of childhood, young Gide compensated for this lack by developing "bad habits," which led to his dismissal from school. An intense feeling of guilt arose in the child and gradually developed into an acute inner conflict. A series of nervous crises further deepened his sense of isolation. The flesh became a monster; his vain struggles against it became an all-absorbing obsession. The story of Gide's recovery from this obsession is the main theme of his autobiography. It is, in this sense, a confession; or, to quote the author's ironical expression, it is "written for a penance."

What makes Gide's case different from thousands of others banalized by the psychoanalysts, is that the story of his recovery is at the same time the story of his awakening to art and society. His method of resolving the conflict was not the suppression of one side for the sake of the other, but a process of gradually overcoming both and integrating his whole personality by means of artistic expression. This process is reflected in all his early works (on the genesis of which this autobiography throws an interesting light); it also explains why the problem of morals became the central issue of Gide's art. His release came with the realization that the only way to end the endless "temptation" was to surrender to it; only then his early "unskillful desire to give life more thickness," which he at first satisfied by building imaginary heavens, was superseded by an art which found this "thickness" in life itself.

Certain critics have maliciously observed that this autobiography will be read chiefly for its brief second part, devoted to the account of the author's association with Oscar Wilde. The text of the jacket also emphasizes these "unabridged," "uncompromising" pages. In reality, the amateurs of the scabrous will be disappointed, for Gide is never purer than in "impurity." What in another context might have been an obscene anecdote is, in Gide's simple narrative, a subordinate, though necessary, phase in an essentially spiritual adventure. In his particular circumstances, in his time, he needed this drastic counter-poison in order to kill in himself the oppressive seed of puritanism; for

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Despite its value as a document, its style which offers excellent examples of Gide's precise and subtle writing, this autobiography does not measure up to certain of his novels. Frequent digressions on the one hand, and shortcuts on the other, remind you too vividly that, more than any other book of Gide, this one was written mainly for himself. Another cause for irritation is his ambiguous use of biblical symbolism. But most of all the contemporary reader ("If It Die" was written nearly two decades ago) will be deterred by the very slowness of Gide's evolution. Today we have no time to dwell at such length on the problems of our personal salvation; everything in us, around us, urges us to take sides, to get out of ourselves. The road must still be traveled, but at least its direction is clear. On the other hand, we are able to avoid the detours Gide was forced to take only because the route has already been surveyed by those who, like him, spent a lifetime in groping and searching. This determines Gide's value as a moralist. The commandment that could be appended to all his works, and especially to this one, would read: "Go farther than I went."

NORBERT GUTERMAN.

The Journalist as Historian

The Twenties: Volume VI of Our Times, by Mark Sullivan. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 694 pages. $3.75.

AS MR. Sullivan's history progresses it becomes increasingly journalistic in selection and method. His story of the 1920's is limited to a full account of the nomination and election of President Harding, and the aftermath of scandal that occupied the country during the first administration of President Coolidge, with such sideshows as Nan Britton, Leopold and Loeb, and Floyd Collins, the cave prisoner of Kentucky. He adds his usual record of cultural phenomena, the books, plays, films and popular songs of the period, and the social effects of prohibition. Especially noteworthy is his review of the post-war literature of the country, with its prevailing mood of disillusionment and disgust.

Mr. Sullivan in approaching the contemporary field in which he is still active as a journalist is obliged to tread warily. The complacency that marked his volumes on the War has grown upon him. With a record of corruption before him not surpassed even in Grant's era, he loyally tries to make the best of things. For Harding he has a tenderness, and toward Daugherty he tries to be conspicuously fair, attributing the damning circumstances of the latter's failure to take the stand at his trial, and his destruction of bank records, to his loyalty to his chief. He rebukes Senator Walsh for carrying the oil investigation into obscure corners. The implications of his account of Governor Coolidge's handling of the police strike in Boston, by virtue of which he rose to national fame, will not be accepted by Bostonians who know the facts. Perhaps the most striking evidence of Mr. Sullivan's complacency is his commendation of the action of General Dawes and Attorney General Daugherty in quieting the investigation of charges of fraud in connection with war contracts. Committees of Congress had unearthed evidence of corruption beside which the oil scandals sink into insignificance, and the resolution calling upon the Attorney General to institute criminal proceedings was amply justified. Mr. Sullivan merely remarks that [illegible] dilatory" and in fact disobeyed the orders of Congress. One of the most powerful arguments in favor of avoiding war in future as an instrument of national policy is the way in which the United States was made a dupe not only by its allies but by its own business men in their dealings with the government. In condoning the conspiracy of silence on this subject, it might seem that Mr. Sullivan's relations and loyalties as a journalist interfere somewhat with his higher obligations as a historian.

ROBERT MORSS LOVETT.

Return from Venusberg

The Street I Know, by Harold E. Stearns. New York: Lee Furman, Inc. 411 pages. $2.75.

THIS IS an autobiography in the literal sense that it is all about Mr. Stearns. In an effort to give us the truth, he has been at the greatest pains to give us all the facts and details of his life—a life that had begun to grow, on the basis of a few details, into legend. But in the deep sense, of course, there has been nothing spectacular about it: from the standpoint of career, it tallies for most of the way with that of several of Mr. Stearns's contemporaries; from the standpoint of personality, it reveals a friendly, intelligent, conventionally unconventional—but not distinctive—American who has known many people and lived much abroad. For writers of Mr. Stearns's age, Harvard, literary New York, bohemian Paris might be termed the main tradition; it was only thereafter, as a racing tipster for Paris newspapers and a too assiduous frequenter of the Dome, that Stearns had his hour of unlikeness and, it so happens, his hour of undoing. He became at length a hard-up expatriate doubly without a home, and lived through some miserable days which make painful reading. Now he has returned to America to regain his lost footing as a writer.

Naturally one perceives here—though for the hundredth time—how for Stearns and many other people the Montparnasse of the twenties was a Venusberg where one lost one's grip over life and sank into a bohemianism less dangerous for one's morals, perhaps, than for one's mind. Men worked on Paris newspapers not because they wanted to be newspapermen but because they wanted to live in Paris. If Stearns is the Horrible Example of such literary expatriates it is because he became the most lost of a lost generation and remains today one of the least reoriented. And the real point of his book lies not in the dalliance it records but in the fact that the dalliance taught him so little. For in spite of his intelligence and his surface worldliness, he is still naïve. He returns home with most of the ideas and illusions he went away with: a faith in a defunct liberal America, a young man's feeling for life and literature, and curiously vague notions about society. He still clings to the literary scene as something nourishing and important in itself: as a writer, he is neither a profound individualist who believes he must function according to the laws of his own nature, nor a man with a formulated idea of the writer's place and function in society.

Understandably enough, the struggle to survive has tended to narrow Mr. Stearns's conceptions—almost to the point, I should say, of making life revolve around whether one is a successful free lance or an unsuccessful one. Hence, in this very personal record dotted with so many names that never take on faces Stearns has faithfully rendered his

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unembittered because he is still romantic. His idle Paris moments might have been the beginning of wisdom, but the truth is that a once very promising writer is less interesting today, not because he fell for a time by the wayside, but because he has not toughened intellectually—because he has not, during a convulsed era, moved ahead with life.

LOUIS KRONENBERGER.

Books in Brief

Lafayette Comes to America, by Louis Gottschalk. The University of Chicago Press. 197 pages. $2.

THESE are sad days for heroes of the old order. In this small volume bristling with references to the sources, Professor Gottschalk demolishes the Lafayette legend. Here the young nobleman—supposedly born with a love of liberty that impelled him to rush to the aid of the struggling colonists—becomes a youth, of ordinary abilities and none too satisfied with his life in France, who grasped at the American Revolution as a path to glory. (In his early years, as a matter of fact, Lafayette displayed no interest in helping the peasants on his numerous and highly lucrative estates.) Mr. Gottschalk makes his case with telling effect by contrasting Lafayette's memoirs with contemporary letters. He disclaims, however, any desire to appear iconoclastic, declaring that "the reputation of Lafayette benefits by the destruction of the 'boy wonder' legend." This is a matter of opinion. Among scholars, it may safely be said, the point of view will not seem alarming. C. L. L.

China's Millions, by Anna Louise Strong. With an introduction by John Cournos. New York: Knight Publishing Company. 475 pages. $2.50.

Eight years ago, Chiang Kai-shek and the Kuomintang party, victorious in their northward march to Shanghai, chose to break with their allies, the Chinese Communists, to destroy the peasants' unions and the labor unions, to conciliate the native bourgeoisie and to compromise with the imperialist powers then in retreat before the power of a united China. Today, with large areas sovietized on the one hand, and Japan breaking off the northern provinces on the other, the choice may seem to have been a poor one, even to Chiang Kai-shek. The account of the Kuomintang decay after this fateful choice is given in three new chapters, with which Anna Louise Strong concludes her vivid impressions of China in the ferment of its nationalist revolution. Readers of Vincent Sheean's "Personal History" will be interested in seeing from another personal view some of the same characters—Borodin, Rayna Prohme, Mme. Sun Yat-sen—that he dealt with. I. S.

The Romance of Hassidism, by Jacob S. Minkin. New York: The Macmillan Company. 408 pages. $3.50.

In this absorbing and scholarly book, Dr. Minkin tells the story of the mystical Jewish sect, the Hassidim, in terms of the lives and personalities of some of its leading exponents. Hassidism was not only a mystical but a democratic movement within Jewry—the result of persecution in Central Europe and of a revolt against the formalized orthodox Jewish religion, which did not meet the emotional needs of the persecuted. It was an ecstatic movement expressing itself in dance, song and drama and, though fought by the Rabbis [illegible] among the Jews of Eastern and Central Europe. It carried within itself, however, the seeds of corruption in the institution of Zaddikism. The Zaddik was the High Priest of Hassidism, as the Rabbi was of orthodox Judaism. In early days these men were frequently saints and martyrs, but in later years they were too often merely cunning exploiters of their poor and ignorant followers. The World War and other external changes hastened the process of internal decay. Dr. Minkin believes, however, that while the externals of Hassidism and its foundation, Zaddikism, are tottering, the forces that brought it to life are again stirring the world. As a result, in many parts of Europe and America "thinking Jewish youth have gone mystical and see in a greatly changed and purified Hassidism . . . the goal of their quest." M. G.

Central Banking under the Federal Reserve System, by Lawrence E. Clark. New York: The Macmillan Company. 450 pages. $5.

This book inevitably repeats much of what has already been said in more detail by other students of the Federal Reserve System. Centering attention upon the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, the author concludes that this has become an increasingly important unit among the twelve regional institutions in spite of the fact that the Federal Reserve System was carefully designed to decentralize banking control. However, the New York bank has frequently exercised functions that were delegated implicitly or explicitly to the Federal Reserve Board. The author implies that this perversion of the original act is responsible for most of the economic ills since 1927. The same facts from which the author draws the above conclusions may also be viewed as showing the essential inconsistency in the theory of the Federal Reserve Act. It was futile to attempt to wrest from New York the financial leadership that was based solidly on the commercial evolution of the country.

M. G. M.

Destiny and Disease in Mental Disorders, with Special Reference to the Schizophrenia Psychoses, by C. Macfie Campbell. New York: W. W. Norton and Company. 207 pages. $2.

Psychiatry, that paradise of theory and "systems," is waking up to the importance of "normal" reality in the understanding of "abnormal" types. In this volume Dr. Campbell, of Harvard University, rejects the orthodox clinical picture of "a mosaic of symptoms" and insists upon studying the individual mental case with due regard to the medical, physiological and social factors involved. This leads him to criticize severely the mechanical formulations of Kraepelin and his school and to attack, as a form of "verbal symbolism," the excesses of diagnostic ingenuity. His own approach is illustrated by an analysis of several case histories drawn principally from the domain of schizophrenia, or the "split" personality. H. W.

Notes of Death and Life, by Theodore Morrison. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company. 96 pages. $2.

Mr. Morrison is a conscientious poet, and displays skill in the handling of his material. But he has very little to say that has not been said before, and the ghosts of Milton, Wordsworth, Keats and Shelley haunt his work, expressing themselves in the kind of antiquated rhetoric that has a trick of making

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon what seems to be an authentic emotion, conveyed in simple terms and germane to the words that surround it. For the most part one feels that Mr. Morrison is less concerned with celebrating his own experiences than with doing homage to the dead body of traditional English poetry.

H. N.

The Island Called Pharos, by Archibald Fleming. New York: Liveright, Inc. 66 pages. $1.50.

Mr. Fleming is briefly introduced by Archibald MacLeish as a young poet worthy of "thoughtful and appreciative attention." This, his first book. contains seven poems of varying maturity. "Atlas," a vision of the Middle Ages, suffers from wordiness and a surfeit of images of shrouds, chains, blood and murkiness. It is obviously immature. "The Haunted House" pictures the modern world as an old decaying dwelling. It is a fine image and Mr. Fleming explores all its possibilities. "Adonis," a lengthy philosophical poem on the wasteland theme, is learned and obscure, perhaps excessively so. But unquestionably Mr. Fleming is a serious, imaginatively gifted young artist, keen to understand our times and project them in poetry. At present his efforts to load every rift and to avoid the obvious often result in crabbed, overloaded lines and a sense of stifled feeling.

F. D.

Black Earth, by Thomas Rowan. New York: Hillman-Curl. $2.50.

"Black Earth" is all about how Markham Crockett, after being fooled by a nasty union organizer who filled his pockets by robbing the men when they had good jobs, finally comes to see that there's no use dynamiting honest folk for a bunch of dirty foreigners. He therefore becomes a scab and manages to get himself killed by a mob of strikers unappreciative of his effort to string up a flag they have torn down. There is a lot of good dirty fun and much high scorn—almost the only things left out are a credible plot and convincing characters, pity, understanding and human good will.

H. C. W.

Contributors

SYLVIA SAUNDERS was Rome correspondent for The Manchester Guardian from 1928 to 1931. She makes a yearly visit to Italy.

JONATHAN MITCHELL, who was formerly a European correspondent for The New York World, now lives in Washington, D. C., where he writes articles on public affairs for various magazines.

WILLIAM P. MANGOLD, who writes our fortnightly department, "On the Labor Front," was one of the New York delegates at the recent convention of the American League Against War and Fascism.

T. R. CARSKADON, whose articles and stories have appeared in The New Republic, Story, Current History and other magazines, is now a member of the editorial staff of The New Republic.

MARIANNE MOORE is the author of a volume of "Selected Poems," published last year by Macmillan, and "Observations," published in 1924. She was acting editor of The Dial from 1925 to 1929, and has contributed verse and criticism to Poetry, The Criterion and other magazines.

C. HARTLEY GRATTAN, author of "Why We Fought," and numerous other books, is working on a new book about Newton D. Baker.

WILL MASLOW, a member of the New York Bar, is a student of consumer problems.

ELEANOR CLARK, who lives in New York City, has contributed to The New Republic and other magazines.

NORBERT GUTERMAN, born in Warsaw, educated at the Sorbonne and now a resident of New York City, writes for magazines here and in Paris.

LOUIS KRONENBERGER edited "An Anthology of Light Verse," which is now one of the titles in the Modern Library, and has just finished editing "An Eighteenth Century Miscellany," soon to be published. He is working on a book dealing with the life of eighteenth-century England.

The initials signed to the brief reviews are those of Carl L. Lokke, Isidor Schneider, Martha Gruening, Margaret G. Myers, Harold Ward, Helen Neville, Frederick Dupee and Harvey Curtis Webster.

"'Paradise Lost' should be seen by every intelligent theatregoer. This production is an event in the history of the American stage; an event of both aesthetic and social importance."—*Waldo Frank.*

PARADISE LOST

By Clifford Odets

LONGACRE THEATRE 48th Street West of Broadway. Eves. 8:30. Mats. Wed. & Sat. 2:30

NEW FILM ALLIANCE presents

"MOANA OF THE SOUTH SEAS"

By FLAHERTY

Director of MAN OF ARAN

Sunday, JAN. 19 at NEW SCHOOL

66 West 12th Street

6:30 & 9:00 P. M.

TICKETS: 50c

THE SPECIAL CLASSIFIED RATE OF THE NEW REPUBLIC IS:

ONE INCH—
1 *insertion* $4.00

ONE INCH—
3 *insertions* $3.50

ONE INCH—
6 *insertions* $3.00

Larger space proportionately more

THE NEW REPUBLIC
40 East 49th Street,
New York, N. Y.

MEETINGS

The Minds of the Middle Class, a lecture by LEWIS COREY, author of **The Crisis of the Middle Class**, Tuesday, Jan. 21st, at 8:20 p. m., Hotel Delano, 108 W. 43rd St. Chairman, GEORGE SOULE. Auspices, League of American Writers. Admission, 35c.

SOCIAL INSURANCE

TSA. (Terminable Securities Act.) Social Security can never be attained by taxing pay-rolls. They are the last thing in the world that should be taxed. TSA offers a much sounder proposal—it goes to the root of the evil—that government-created form of private property known as corporation Common Stock. But the S. E. C. to whom the plan has been officially and properly referred, does not dare to discuss the hortifying proposal. Write your representative in Congress to press them for a report.

Box 1163, Boston, Mass.

TRAVEL

RUSSIAN TOURS $231.00

Leadership: Jerome Davis of Yale, Professor Lucy Textor of Vassar, Dr. Julius Hecker and Henry Wadsworth Longfellow Dana. *Routed via England, Denmark and Finland at no extra cost.* Round table discussions with Soviet leaders.

Write for Booklet C

WILLIAM M. BARBER

BABSON PARK MASS.

ORANGES FOR SALE

TREE-RIPENED INDIAN RIVER

Oranges and Grapefruit

Direct from our grove to you

55 lb. Basket—Prepaid $3.25

Satisfaction and safe arrival guaranteed

Write for price list and folder

T. R. INDIAN RIVER ORANGE CO.
Cocoa, Fla.

Our 10th Year—Serving 8000 Customers

COOPERATIVE RESIDENCE PLAN

MEN, WOMEN, professional, business, wanting to maintain high living standard at low cash outlay while seeking permanent position, writing, or studying, investigate Cooperative Residence; club life, congenial persons. Work part-time and pay $4.75 up weekly in exchange room, board. Write Union Church, 229 West 48th, New York.

CORRESPONDENCE CLUBS

"MENTAL STARVATION FOR LACK of stimulating intellectual environment," self-diagnosis for mentally marooned. 3c stamp

Order your books—all books—mailed anywhere in the U. S. A.

POSTAGE FREE

from NEW REPUBLIC BOOKS

LICENSED FOR PERSONAL USE ONLY
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED